

NO. XXVII.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOL. V.—No. III.
MAY AND JUNE, 1828.

CONTENTS.

MISCELLANY.

- Sketch of the Life and Character of
the Hon. Samuel Howe - - - 185
The Rite of the Lord's Supper a Sym-
bolical Language - - - - 203
POETRY.—Heaven - - - - 202

REVIEW.

- ART. VII.—1. Fourteenth Annual
Report of the Massachusetts So-
ciety for the Suppression of Intem-
perance.
2. Discourses on Intemperance,
preached in the Church in Brattle
Square, Boston, April, 5, 1827, the
Day of Annual Fast, and April 8,
the Lord's Day following. By
JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M.
3. First Annual Report of the Exe-
cutive Committee of the American
Society for the Promotion of Tem-
perance - - - - - 209
ART. VIII.—1. The future Punish-
ments of Infants not a Doctrine of
Calvinism; 2. The Future Pun-
ishment of Infants never a Doc-
trine of the Calvinistic Churches;
3. On the Future State of Infants;
three Letters addressed 'To the
Editor of the Christian Examiner,

and published in 'The Spirit of the
Pilgrims' for January, February,
and March. By the Rev. LYMAN
BEECHER, D. D. - - - - 229

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

- Which Society shall you join, Libe-
ral or Orthodox? - - - - 264
Pierpont's Ordination Sermon - - 264
Loveland's Greek Lexicon - - - 265
Thrush on War - - - - - 265
The School - - - - - 266
Griffin's Convention Sermon - - - 267

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Mission at Calcutta, 267—
American Unitarian Association, 269—
Massachusetts Convention of Congre-
gational Ministers, 272—Ordination at
Baltimore, 272—Installation in Boston,
272—Ordination at Dennis, 273—Or-
dination at Brighton, 273—Ordination
at New York, 273.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Russia, 273—Greece, 274—Great Britain,
274—Portugal, 274—South America,
275—Central America, 275—Mexico,
275—United States, 275

OBITUARY.

Mrs Robinson. - - - - 276

BOSTON,
PUBLISHED BY BOWLES & DEARBORN, 50 WASHINGTON STREET.

LONDON, BY JOHN MILLER, AMERICAN LIBRARY, 40 PALL MALL.

LIVERPOOL, BY EDWARD WILLMER, 25 LORD STREET.

Hiram Tupper, Printer—Bromfield Lane.

1828.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

THE price of subscription for this work is three dollars a year, payable on the delivery of the second number, on the 20th of April.

THE four volumes of this work now published, or either of them, or single numbers, may be obtained of any of the Agents, at the subscription prices; viz. Vols. I. and II. at \$2, and Vols. III. and IV. at \$3, and the numbers in proportion.

Complete sets handsomely half bound in Russia or common calf, can be had of the Publishers in Boston.

✍ If Authors, Editors, or Publishers will send copies of their works to the Editor, Boston, they shall be either Reviewed, Noticed, put upon the List of New Publications, or Advertised upon the Covers.

NOTICE.—The Editor acknowledges that an apology is due to his subscribers for the late day at which this number of the Examiner appears. He has none to offer, however, which is not of too personal a character to be presented here; though he may be permitted to say, that at the usual time of preparing the number, sickness put it out of his power to attend to it, and that he has since met with various disappointments in regard to matter intended for it, which none but editors can appreciate or perhaps understand. But it should not be forgotten, that the three numbers for the present year contain double the quantity of matter given in any three numbers of the preceding volumes, and that the large part of the work heretofore occupied by Collections, is now filled with original pieces. The labor of the Editor is of course proportionally increased. The next number may be expected early in October, and the succeeding one at the regular time.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

THE Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, have our thanks for putting at our disposal a portion of their correspondence, which we hoped to have inserted in this number. It shall appear in our next.

'V's' communication shall be inserted at the first opportunity. We should be pleased to hear from him on topics of more immediate interest.

N. S. SIMPKINS, & Co. BOSTON, HAVE JUST PUBLISHED 'THE DAILY MONITOR,

Or Reflections for each Day in the Year; containing Practical Inferences from Christian Doctrines, Ecclesiastical History, Sacred Biography, &c. intended for the Use of all Classes, and fitted to the various Circumstances of Life. By CHARLES BROOKS, Minister of the Third Church in Hingham, Mass.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. III.

MAY AND JUNE, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

**SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE HON.
SAMUEL HOWE.**

WE wish to preserve some record of the virtue of the individual, whose recent loss our community has so deeply felt. Such men are not given us often. And when they leave us, we feel it to be a duty, if nothing more, to gather up the fruits of their lives, the benefits of their good examples, and add them to the common treasury of knowledge and virtue. In attempting this now, we are very anxious to avoid all extravagance. We dare not give full expression to our feelings; for we know that to many they would seem too strong. In such a case, it is better to come short, than to exceed the truth, or what others would consider the truth. It is better always; and particularly, when, as here, there is in the character itself which we are desirous of presenting, much to restrain us. We would not violate what we know would be the feelings of the man we love and honor. For if he possessed any one trait, to the strength of which, more than of others, all will bear testimony, it was that which would peremptorily forbid any approach to extravagance, in the performance of this sad duty.

In the life of Judge Howe, there was little of incident that claims attention. Yet it may be well, as a help to a proper understanding and fair estimate of his character, to give a brief outline of his history.

Samuel Howe was the son of the late Dr Estes Howe, a physician of Belchertown in the county of Hampshire. He was born in that place on the twentieth of June, 1785. He received his early education at the common town school, which at that time offered very few advantages. He very early discovered a love of reading and study, finding in them greater attractions than in the common amusements of his age. Books were not easily obtained, and he often rode several miles to procure them. There appeared, even then, marks of that regularity and economy of time, which were so observable in after life. At the age of twelve, he was placed at the academy in New Salem; and afterwards at Deerfield Academy, where he was prepared for college. He entered the sophomore class of Williamstown College, in 1801. The most that I have learned of this part of his life, is, that he maintained a most respectable standing in a class of great merit, was exemplary in all his conduct, and the object of high esteem. He is said to have been particularly fond of mathematics, and to have made more than common proficiency in those studies, considering his limited opportunities.

Immediately after receiving his degree, he began the study of law in the office of the Hon. Jabez Upham of Brookfield, where he remained about a year. He then entered the Law School at Litchfield, Connecticut, at that time under the superintendence of Chief Justice Reeves and Judge Gould. From this school he went to Stockbridge, and finished his preparatory studies in the office of Judge Sedgwick of that place. He was admitted to the Berkshire Bar in August, 1807, and commenced the practice of his profession in Stockbridge. Shortly after, he removed to Worthington in the county of Hampshire, where he soon distinguished himself as a lawyer and advocate, and had a large share of business. In 1820 he removed to Northampton, and in the following year was appointed one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, at the early age of thirtysix. And here I cannot forbear to mention, that the members of the bar in one of our counties, who at first were greatly displeased, and had loudly and formally expressed their displeasure, at the appointment of Mr Howe to this office, after seeing him one week on the bench, united in a public and most flattering expression of their entire satisfaction. It is well known that, in the duties of this responsible station he continued to the last, and that but a few weeks before his death, hastening probably that melancholy event, he gave proofs of indefatigable industry, and a fidelity which regarded not comfort, health, nor even life.

Beside those already mentioned, the subject of this notice held other honorable stations. Not long after his removal to Northampton, he associated himself with an eminent member of the bar in that place, for the establishment of the Law School, in the arduous duties of which he expended much of his strength, and the success of which is too well known to need any particular notice. He was early a member of our State Legislature; a place, however, of which he seems never to have been ambitious, professional and not political eminence being his aim. About four years since, he was made a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was also recently appointed by our Legislature to the Board of Trustees of Amherst College.

Such is a very general sketch of a life that has now closed. That so many high and responsible trusts were delegated to our friend, and so much public service was performed by him, in the space of twenty years, is of itself the highest encomium; and when we think of the fidelity and ability with which these trusts and duties were discharged, our admiration is surpassed only by our grief, that the influence of such a character and life is thus suddenly, and in its fulness, withdrawn. Many looks of anxious and painful interest, were fixed upon that strength as it began to fail. It was never firm, and for some months there had been strong indications of increasing weakness. Still the most arduous duties were performed with scrupulous fidelity. This could not continue. At the close of his last great effort, the exhausted frame sunk, and in three weeks the grave closed upon all that remained on earth of him, whose loss to many, very many, is the rending of one of life's strongest and tenderest chords. He died in Boston about midnight, on the nineteenth of January last.

In presenting the character of Judge Howe, our attention is first called to his *professional* worth. Of this, it may seem presumptuous in any one unacquainted with the science of law, to speak confidently. But there were prominent features in this character which none could overlook, and which require no peculiar talent to describe. Of these, one of the most remarkable, and that which led to every other, was his ardent *love* of the law. This existed from first to last in an uncommon degree. That, which to many who stand high in the profession is a dry and irksome study, was his delight. In the most abstract and uninteresting parts of it, he could always find a pleasure and even excitement, equal to that which is awakened by powerful

works of fiction. This was apparent in his whole private and public course, and was strong enough to remove many serious obstacles, and overpower even the sense of severe pain. For often, by this interest and excitement, aided by a high principle of duty, have we seen him sustained in the discharge of public functions, when suffering from severe bodily disease ; sustained to the last moment of duty, and then sinking. This love of his profession, as it was the spring of great improvement, so did it yield him the greatest satisfaction ; conferring its reward at every step, and most of all at the last, in the sober review of life.

It was the spring of great improvement, and profound learning was one of its natural effects. This is worthy of particular notice. I believe it is hazarding nothing to say, that very few men, in this or any country, have possessed, at his age, a more thorough knowledge of the law ; certainly not one with only his advantages. His early instruction was very imperfect. The great defects of his classical education he was often heard to lament ; and to the last there were occasional, though not frequent, appearances of carelessness in style, and want of strict accuracy in the use of language, which are said formerly to have been much more obvious. These he was every day overcoming, but they show how much there was to be overcome. And when to these defects in the early culture of his mind, we add the evils of a naturally feeble constitution, and the demands made upon his time and resources by a very early and more than usual portion of domestic care, we cannot but regard his attainments as uncommon. His legal knowledge was remarkable, not only for its extent, but also, and perhaps more, for its accuracy. His research was profound, patient, and thorough, and his memory very retentive. He read everything connected with his profession, which seemed worth the time, though not connected directly with his own duties ; and all that he read was faithfully stored, and always at command. He was seldom at a loss for authorities or illustrations, name, place, or any important circumstance. At the bar and on the bench, in his arguments to the court, his charges to the jury, his exercises as a teacher, and in the performance of all his official duties, it is confidently believed that few have discovered more readiness, correctness, or extensive and thorough knowledge.

Among the characteristics of his mind as a lawyer, were sound judgment, acuteness, quickness and correctness of apprehension, fairness, and independence. These, combined with that enthusiastic love of the law, and standing upon the firm basis of that extensive and profound learning just spoken of,

could not fail to give him early a high rank in a most honorable and difficult profession. We have never seen a man, who appeared to surmount the difficulties of that profession with more ease, or bear its honors, and discharge the duties of one of its first offices, with more simplicity, more commanding yet unpretending dignity, obvious yet unconscious superiority. In his decisions he was cautious, but prompt; always open to conviction from any quarter, weighing impartially all circumstances, having a kind regard to all worthy feelings, quick to discern between right and wrong, indignant at any attempt to pervert justice or swerve in the least from truth, and fearless in awarding to virtue its merited reward, to vice its just punishment. None could observe him in public or private life, and not see the high moral principles which governed and ennobled his whole conduct, conferring an elevation, inspiring a confidence, and imparting blessings, which no mere power or talents could ever bestow.

It need not be said, that the man who possessed these qualities, was eminently fitted to be a *teacher* of the science to which he devoted himself. This office he always seemed desirous of assuming, from a willingness and desire to impart to others all the light and knowledge he had been able to acquire himself. In no part of his duty did he take more delight; and in none was he more acceptable or successful. To this, all who have had the benefit of his instructions, bear eager, full, delighted testimony. His urbane dignity, his easy familiarity, his readiness as well as power to communicate his knowledge, his inexhaustible fund of pleasant practical illustration, the amenity and kindness of his manners at all times—these are spoken of with a more than common degree of affection and enthusiasm, warm gratitude, and now unmingled sorrow.

But it is not possible to point out separately the traits of this character, nor is it necessary. Indeed, it is not right. For its excellence and beauty did not lie in separate features, but in the united whole. It cannot be said, perhaps, to have been uncommon in any one respect, so much as in all combined. There was a rare cultivation of every power, an unusual faithfulness to every talent, opportunity, and trust, an admirable adjustment of powers, a balance and completeness of character, which we may not expect to see often. This character was formed under no peculiar advantages; indeed, with the great disadvantages of an imperfect education and a feeble constitution. But it gave him an early distinction, allowed by all to be merited. It placed him in a sphere, in which his powers were

largely exercised, and their influence widely felt. Few have had more to contend with, yet very few, none have been more punctual, resolute, laborious, faithful to every duty. Most truly, in this respect, most emphatically may it be said of him, that he lived not to himself; for his strength was again and again exhausted in the service of others. How often have we seen him prostrated by great exertion, yet returning, with an aching head and powers almost spent, to the scene of duty, and devoting himself to its performance with the same ardor and unrelaxing diligence. No indisposition, no love of ease, no attachment to domestic scenes, dear as they were, no personal considerations of any kind, made him deaf to the call of duty.

But he was not a professional man only. There was nothing confined or illiberal in his pursuits. He was a general scholar. He kept pace with the progress of the age in almost every department; particularly, making himself thoroughly acquainted, whatever effort it might cost, with any branch of science or philosophy, which would aid, in any way, the discharge of his duties. He seemed ever on the watch to note the changes, the advances, the ever varying circumstances and character of society, with the wish to adapt himself to its changes, to meet its wants, to promote its progress, to direct his professional and other influence, all his energy to the one noble purpose of social, intellectual, moral improvement in those around him.

To do this, to make himself familiar with the literature of the day, and all that should engage the attention of a member of society, and at the same time to maintain a high standing in his own laborious calling, he knew would require great *industry*. And this is a part of his character, or more properly of his conduct, which should not be passed over. To his industry he owed everything. It was the groundwork and whole explanation of his character and usefulness. It began with his earliest habits, and continued while strength remained. Unusual method in the arrangement, and frugality and assiduity in the use of his time, were features so prominent that the most heedless observer could not have overlooked them. Many proofs might be given; some of them not common. It is well known, that he seldom, if ever, travelled without a book as his companion, when no better companion was at hand; nor did he ever ride far, without making himself master of the contents of a volume. A portion, even of that time which his feeble health required him to give to recreation and to pass in places of public resort, was regularly set apart and conscientiously devoted to reading.

Indeed, nearly all his general reading, which was by no means restricted or superficial, was done at such times, and in the short intervals of business at court. He had also the habit, formed early and always continued, of reading to his family, whenever it could be done; and he ascribed to it much of the happiness of his life. There was a fixed habit of turning, if practicable, every hour and every opportunity to some good account. There seemed to rest upon his mind continually a sense of the immense value of time; a conviction that the use or abuse of it involved lasting consequences to the individual and to society, and that there was with every man an obligation, high and sacred, to devote his time, not to himself, not to trifling pursuits, but to others, to the community.

Of this trait we love to speak. Generally, we know, industry is not ranked with the virtues; certainly not with the great virtues. It seldom attracts attention or commands admiration. It is often passed by in neglect, and sometimes sneered at as not of christian stamp, nor of much value. To us it does not wear this doubtful character. We are disposed to give it a high place on the scale of moral worth. In our view, as in the apostle's, to be 'diligent in business,' is closely connected with being 'servant in spirit,' and 'serving the Lord.' Assuredly, if he who aims to keep his powers in constant exercise, to fill his time, to double the talents entrusted to him, is to be regarded as in any measure a Christian, then is industry a virtue. If to live for others, and to strive to promote the welfare of those around us, is one of the purposes of our existence, and one of the conditions of the divine approbation, then is industry of great moral value. Without this, how can a man be regarded as a religious man? To this, how much private and public happiness may be ascribed. In our community especially, how many men do we see in our highest and most responsible places, raised there by this quality alone; and how much more are such men to be honored, than those on whom wealth, or any adventitious circumstances, have conferred distinction. The former are the true benefactors. Than a man of industry, though this be his only talent, and his sphere very humble, society can hardly have a more useful member, a greater ornament or blessing.

There is another virtue of a similar character, for which he was distinguished; *economy* in the midst of liberality. In regard to this also, there are great mistakes. He usually is considered the most liberal, the most benevolent and generous man, who expends most for the entertainment of friends, or gives most in public charities, even though his family and those who

entirely depend upon him, are sufferers by it. Very differently does it appear to us. We regard that as the true generosity and benevolence, which makes its ability the measure of its exertion, consulting first the wants of those who have the first claim, and then doing all for others that it possibly can, doing it for the good of others, and not for its own display or credit, showing to the world, that liberality, active and large benevolence, is perfectly consistent with frugality, and that the latter is as noble and useful a virtue as the former. For a liberality like this, the man to whom we refer was distinguished. In hospitality, in humanity, for the support and spread of learning and religion, no man was more ready than he, to do all that he could, in justice to the many who depended wholly on his daily exertions. But he would not do more. He would never infringe the rights, or sacrifice the comfort of these, for the sake of a name or praise. He believed, and feared not to act upon the belief, that there was a truer benevolence, a greater and far more useful generosity; that society at large, mankind would be more benefited, by a frugal, quiet, and consistent liberality.

The value to the community of such a character is immense. We can never calculate it. We never know it, until it is withdrawn, until we feel its loss, and see the dreadful chasm that is left, and hear the voice of lamentation, and the mingling of sorrow, that pass through the land. And when has this testimony been given, in a more full and unequivocal manner than now, to the public worth of the man whose character we are attempting to delineate? He was universally known, and it is believed there are few, even among those who knew him only as a public minister, who have not some feeling of personal loss in his death. His powers and station enabled him to do much for all, and he aimed to be faithful to his ability. He seemed to be deeply impressed with the responsibility that rested upon him, and fearful often, I think I may say always very fearful, that he should not in all respects be equal to that responsibility. This feeling prompted him to great exertion. It made him regardless, too regardless, of his own strength, and thoughtful only of the service he could render. He was a benevolent man in the best sense; not confining his benevolence to good wishes, common sympathy, or loud professions; much less keeping it ostentatiously in sight as a claim upon the public notice and admiration. He was as far from everything of this kind as any man that ever lived. It was his utter abhorrence, and we believe he would rather have forfeited all reputation for benevolence, than have made any display of it. They who knew him at all, will bear

witness to his unassuming character, in every relation and exertion. Yet, we repeat, he was a benevolent man in the best sense. There were in his life many acts of private beneficence—of that silent, unobtrusive charity, whose disinterestedness admits not of a moment's doubt. But these should be left to the silence which they loved. We appeal now to his life; a whole life devoted, may we not say, sacrificed, to the public service. We appeal to those many relations, domestic, public, civil, and religious, which he filled, and filled so well. But the appeal need not be made; for our community strongly expressed their sense of his worth, before and after that event which deprived them of so valuable a member.

Of his public life, but one remark further need be made; and this applies to his whole life. To whatever eminence he rose, or whatever influence he acquired, it was attained entirely by a uniform, unpretending, consistent course—by the power of character; and this adds another to the proofs, so honorable to our country, that integrity and industry are the surest passports to distinction and the confidence of all.

Of the *private* character of Judge Howe, we would next speak; his fidelity to the domestic relations. But to this, we can only allude. For they who often saw him there, they especially who leaned upon him there, have too painful a sense of his worth, to permit his private virtues to be drawn from their sanctuary, and exposed to the public gaze. We may however be permitted to say—our feelings will not permit us to say less—that as a son, a relation which he sustained until within two years of his death, and which made in some respects peculiar demands upon his fidelity—as a brother, a husband, father, friend, he exhibited a purity and strength of affection, and inspired a degree of interest, an ardor of attachment, a feeling of dependence, and now of loss, such as we have seldom known. Bitter indeed are the tears that have gushed from the hearts of the bereaved. And nothing, nothing but that consolation which is stronger than life or death, which earth has no power either to give or take away, is sufficient to assuage their grief.

But one trait remains; and this we are hardly willing to present as a distinct trait, for it entered into every part of his character, and its full excellence can be known only by observing it in connexion with other features. Nor is it with entire freedom that we speak of this trait; for, strong as is our own conviction of its power and value, we know that he to whom it belonged would have been more than unwilling that it should ever

be made the subject of public remark. Yet there is a sense in which the public now have a right to know this part of his character. Moreover it is this on which we most delight to dwell; it is this which gives most, which gives all the comfort to the afflicted; it is this which imparts to his whole character a beauty and grandeur, that nothing else could. You know, reader, to what I refer. For you know there is nothing in this world that confers an elevation and dignity to be compared with that which religion confers. This elevation and dignity were his. He whom we mourn was a *religious* man. He was truly and eminently a Christian.

In asserting this thus strongly and very emphatically, without qualification or reserve, we feel that we are taking upon ourselves great responsibility. But we are willing to meet it. For beside that we have had opportunities of knowledge, such as are not given to every one, we make our appeal to that of which every one may judge; to the life, to those fruits by which alone men are to be surely known. According to any other standard, certainly according to that of a sound faith, in the popular acceptance of those words, we could not claim for him the name of Christian. For he did not belong to the dominant party. Indeed he belonged to no party. It were a great wrong to call him, in any narrow sense, a party man. What his religious opinions were, every one knew, for he never concealed them. He held them most firmly. For their quiet enjoyment and wider spread, he incurred many reproaches, and made sacrifices; and he was always ready to avow, and, in every proper way, to advance and defend them. This in fact was a natural consequence of the manner in which his opinions had been formed. He had taken them, not from education, and early, unconscious habit, for these had given a different direction; not from man's teaching, for this he regarded as of no authority or value in comparison with the teaching of the Son of God; not from ambition, a desire of popularity and ease—this least of all, for then he would hardly have encountered, as he did, the power of fashion, the violence of prejudice, the opposition and clamor of the multitude. No. He had taken his opinions and imbibed his spirit at the uncorrupted fountains of truth, and at the footstool of that Being with whom he held habitual communion.

He had been educated in the Calvinistic faith; and though he seems never to have been a bigot to that or any faith, he reached mature life in the full persuasion that this was the religion of the bible, nor could he regard without fearful solicitude, those who had embraced a different system. It was not

until after he had entered upon his profession and removed to Worthington, that he was led, by some peculiar circumstances, to examine the foundations of his religion. This he did patiently and thoroughly, giving the whole subject a long and deliberate investigation, reading much on both sides, bending his highest powers to the task, and seeking continually, anxiously, divine light and guidance. He took nothing upon trust. He cared not for human authority. He feared not human judgment, nor shrunk from the suspicion or sacrifice to which the adoption of an unpopular faith might subject him. Truth was his only aim. The bible was his only guide. And the faculties which God had given him, and the aid he had promised, were the only means by which he sought to learn what God had spoken and what he required. The result is well known. The force of education and first impressions, yielded to the power of uncorrupted truth and the convictions of an unshackled mind. He became a decided, firm, serious Unitarian. More than this, his faith in Christianity as a divine system, became more clear, rational, settled, and delightful. Never, it is said without fear of contradiction, never has any man risen from the study of the sacred volume, with a higher reverence for its divine authority, or a firmer conviction that its truths are all worthy of entire confidence, affection, and obedience. These convictions and feelings attended him to the latest hour, and became stronger with every trial of their strength. More than once have we heard him speak of the clearness and power with which the evidences of Christianity affected his mind ; and that, not as a religion to be believed merely, but cordially embraced, studied seriously and habitually, and made the governing rule of life, and the foundation of all hope. More than once has he given it as his opinion, as well as the declaration of some of the most eminent men who have adorned his profession, that if the testimony to the truth of the gospel, the evidence on which the supernatural character of Christ and his religion rests, should be brought into any court, and subjected to any earthly tribunal, it must be admitted as entirely conclusive, or all common acknowledged principles of evidence must be abandoned.

To us it is everything to hear such a man speak thus on such a subject. There is no evading nor adding to the force of such a decision, as regards our religion itself or the character of the man. From every fair mind it must go far to dissipate all doubt, and rebuke all coldness and indifference. It is better, more convincing and valuable, than any testimony from the appointed ministers of religion ; for in them it is always considered

by the world as in some degree at least a matter of course, of profession, or policy. Besides, when we give ourselves up entirely to one study, there is danger that our minds may be narrowed, and that arguments and principles which we see chiefly in one connexion, may assume in our eyes a character or force that does not belong to them. But when we see a man of a different profession, having the most favorable opportunities for observing human nature and weighing testimony in every connexion and form, bringing high powers, a clear, unbiassed judgment, to the examination of this question, and reasoning upon it with as much coolness, deliberation, and impartiality, as upon any question of law or equity, we feel that his decision is entitled to confidence ; we feel our own faith confirmed and invigorated by it ; and if we see its good fruits, its sincerity and influence in the life of him who exhibits it, it gathers an importance which can hardly be overrated.

And this is the great value of the testimony before us. It is not that this individual was better able to judge of the truth of Christianity, or a firmer believer than many others ; for we know and rejoice that many of the leading men of his profession have been, and are, equally firm, and hold the same rational and serious views of truth. But we attach an especial value to this testimony, because it was remarkably consistent throughout. In public and private, as a citizen, a lawyer, and a judge, in his domestic and social walks, at the family altar and in the temple, in sickness and health, in life and death, this man was the same ; conscientious, unpretending, candid, upright, faithful, firm. No eye but one of prejudice or malignity, could discover in him anything inconsistent with strict moral principle. It is saying much, but no more than the truth, that they who have known him best, who have been admitted most freely to the secrets of his breast, and to that sanctuary where there can be no effectual disguise or equivocation, have thought most highly of the purity of his character, the strength of his principles, and the benevolence of his heart. Oh ! it is beyond the power of man, of the opposing world, to move their faith in his integrity and inestimable worth. They cannot, indeed, point to any one act, any loud professions, any emblazoned charities, or popular opinions ; for they know that for his opinions he was cast out from christian fellowship, and the table of his Lord was barred against him. But they could point to many unnoticed acts ; to consistent, uniform good conduct ; to unvarying kindness and charity, the more disinterested and real, because unpretending ; to opinions held in despite of reproach, at no little sacrifice, and

with the firmest adherence to conscience and duty. They do point to a uniform, laborious, irreproachable life ; short, but filled with service, and useful beyond the common measure ; harassed by continual sickness and often by severe suffering, yet devoted, without a murmur and without cessation, to the highest interests of the public, to the purest delights of family and friends, to the cultivation of the best powers, to the promotion of truth, virtue, and happiness.

Who will compare such a life, such a religion with one of mere opinions, professions, or forms ? Who will compare its purity, its benevolence, its disinterestedness, its conformity to the christian standard, with a religion, whose energies are locked up in the breast, or wasted upon the tongue, or devoted only to those of a particular name or creed, dispensing no real blessing to the community ? If any would do this, let him look at the life of Jesus, and stand rebuked. It is a noble sentiment—and we rejoice to express it in the dying words of him whose memory we so fondly cherish—that the exact measure of our happiness, is the degree in which we make others happy. We may add, this is the measure of our religion too, if the happiness we impart to others, is that which God would confer, the happiness of virtue. To seek to promote this, in ourselves and around us, is to be a Christian.

And this we believe, this we know, to have been the constant aim of the man we mourn ; the language of his life, no less than of his death. Religion with him was a deep principle, having its seat within, not without, and putting forth its power in actions rather than words. If it did not, like a distinct imposing feature, or an occasional garment, force itself upon your attention, it was because it was always worn, or incorporated with the whole man, and its influence equally diffused throughout the character and life. It governed the temper, it subdued the passions, it chastened the conversation, it purified and warmed the heart, it ennobled the mind, it elevated the affections above sordid and debasing pursuits, it prompted to a life of active, selfdenying, unwearied usefulness. It led him to take a sober view of life ; of life in all its relations, its duties, opportunities, powers, destiny. It led him to speak and act with great deliberation, looking to the consequences of conduct upon others and himself, upon the present and the future, in this world and through eternity. It kept continually before him his own weakness and liability to err, and made him charitable to the weakness and errors of others, cautious in judgment, sparing of condemnation, yet always open and resolute in discriminating between

right and wrong, both in opinion and practice, eager to extol and exalt the one, decided and fearless in condemning the other. It carried his views and aim far beyond the narrow contemptible bounds of party and a name. It told him he was to live to mankind, and not to a favored few ; that God and Jesus, and no earthly master had sent him into the vineyard, and that in imitation of their example, he should open the arms of affection, and send out good influences, to all. In short, his religion made him feel deeply and fearfully the burden of responsibility that rested upon him, and upon every member of society, every intelligent, accountable, immortal being ; a responsibility extending to every talent, every faculty, every hour, and reaching in its solemn consequences through uncounted and countless ages. To discharge this responsibility, in all its vastness and sacredness, was his single aim. That he effected it, we do not say. We are content to say, as he did in the final review, 'Thou, God, knowest.'

Such, in our view, was the religion of Judge Howe, and such its influence on his life. We are aware that the picture may to some seem extravagant—some who knew him not, or saw him only through an unfavorable medium. Of those who knew him well, and saw him as he really was, there need be no fear. I am persuaded that there dwelt upon his mind, a conviction, more than usually strong, habitual, and operative, of his dependence and accountableness. It was to be seen in his discharge of public duty, in his conversation, and particularly in his private correspondence. His letters to his family, especially those to his children, and I hope I do not violate confidence in speaking of them, are filled with evidences of a serious, devout spirit, expressions of the most affectionate, anxious interest in the temporal, and much more in the spiritual welfare of those depending upon him, and earnest exhortations to diligence, sobriety, prayer, and all christian virtue. He seems ever to feel, and strives to inspire the feeling, that we are sent into the world for something more than our own indulgence or amusement ; that we have higher connexions than those which come and go with a breath ; that we came from God, and should live to God. This feeling was not occasional, nor ever wild ; but, calm and habitual, like his religion itself, it was not a passion, but a principle. It brought God very near to him. The thought of his presence, his perfections, his will, was associated with all that surrounded him ; with the appearances of nature, no less than with the truths of revelation. In one of his letters, written just after beholding some of the grandest scenes which

our country presents, he thus speaks of their effect ;—‘ The view of such scenes always seems to draw me nearer to my God. In the contemplation of his beautiful works, I feel more strongly impressed with a sense of his benevolence, and am ashamed that I should ever be unwilling to resign myself, without reserve, into his almighty hand.’

And was he unwilling, when the hour came ? Did the religion, which guided, strengthened, and cheered him through life, forsake him in death ? Did the views for which he had borne suspicion and reproach, for his conscientious adherence to which he had been forbidden to approach the table of a common Lord, or even to dedicate his children to Him who gave them, the views to which he had been brought by his own fearless and devout examination of the volume of truth, and in which he had found support and satisfaction, light and blessing in all his course of duty, toil, and suffering—did these views tremble and fail as the great conflict came near ? It could not be. It was not. That same faith ministered abundantly, gloriously, to his support and joy in the hour of bitter trial. Fail ? No. It became stronger as nature drooped. It brightened as the darkness gathered. Then was its glory and its full triumph. It pointed the dying believer through the breaking clouds, up to the unfading light which had always cheered him, and the rock on which he had securely rested. He met that messenger, to whom we are all perhaps too apt to give the name and character of a king of terror and awful gloom—he met him as a friend ; taking him away indeed from friends dear to his heart, from scenes that he loved, from cares that he would willingly bear, and duties that he would gladly perform longer, but calling him to higher duties, to holier scenes, to many friends who had gone before, and to the surest, best friend of all. He departed full of this hope, strong in this faith ; exhibiting to those around him its reality, its sustaining power, the delightful confidence it inspired, the heavenly serenity it imparted, the unearthly strength it gave, the glorious triumph it achieved, the pure, unclouded light which it caused to burst upon the parting soul. Of such a death, we love to think and speak. For there seems to us to go out from it a voice, strong and eloquent as Heaven’s own truth, pleading for religion, for confidence in God, fidelity to Jesus, benevolence to man ; yes, pleading, as with an angel’s tongue, for humanity, truth, virtue, and the hope of a blessed immortality.

Yet of this, we fear to speak freely ; for we know how lamentably such things have been abused. We feel, too, that there is in truth a sacredness in a death bed scene, which should never

be profaned. There are thoughts, moreover, awakened by the recollection of him who thus died, of what he was, and of the instinctive delicacy with which he would have shrunk from any display of the solemn realities of death, which restrain us from a full expression of our feelings, or at least warn us to offer nothing more than a sober, exact statement of what actually was. This we do for our own consolation, and in the belief, that, viewed in connexion with his life, its testimony to the power of religion, and the worth of such views of religion as he entertained, is of great value, and should not be withheld.

From the first violent attack of disease he discovered entire resignation to that event which he saw approaching, and the nearer it approached, the more perfect was his serenity, and the stronger his faith. Indeed its approach at this time was not, we believe, wholly unexpected. A few weeks before, he had expressed to a friend his belief that the December term of the court would finish his career. Although the premonition was not particularly regarded then, he himself remembered and referred to it the last night of his life. For about twelve days before his death, he was deprived of the power of utterance, and appeared in a great measure unconscious of what was passing. It was feared that he would leave the world in this silence and darkness; but, through the goodness of the God in whom he trusted, there was something better in reserve for him and his friends. The clouds that came up as if to obscure his declining sun, were to be dispersed, and the setting of that orb to be more glorious than its rising or meridian splendor.

On the evening of the last day, a near friend entered his chamber, expecting only to witness his silent departure. At the same time his son arrived from a distant town. Their well known faces seemed to recall the dying man to a sense of his whole situation. Affectionately he took the offered hand, enquired after the health of those who had been left, and said he believed it was nearly over with him. After speaking of his previous weakness and distraction of thought, he expressed a wish that he might be permitted to do the little that remained for him to do in this world. He prayed for strength. It was granted; and in the power of it, he addressed those who were about him, clearly and most impressively. He spoke first of the blessings that surrounded him in his sickness, and seemed particularly grateful to God and to his earthly friends, that, though away from home, every attention and kindness had been shown him. He then gave all needed directions as to his worldly affairs. Having done this, and dismissed the world from his

mind forever, he expressed warmly and emphatically his entire confidence, his gratitude, his affectionate interest in those most near to him, in all his friends, and commended them to God. From them his thoughts turned more particularly upon himself, his past life and present prospects. He said he had always felt that high trusts were committed to him, and that his was a solemn responsibility. He had endeavoured to meet and faithfully discharge all his duties; and had been astonished often at the degree of light and satisfaction which were afforded him, as from above. His trust was in the mercy of God for the acceptance of his humble efforts, and the pardon of his remissness and sin. To God he appealed; and, as he spoke of his trust in him, of his firm faith in the religion of his Son, of the support he had derived from this religion through life, and its increasing power as life drew nearer its close, its power over all terrors of death and the dissolution of nature—there was a collectedness, a strength, an ardor, an eloquence, a sublime uplifting of the spirit far, far above the changing and passing objects of earth, which turned that chamber of death into a temple of calm and holy triumph. All tears were dried. The spirit of heaviness became indeed a garment of praise; the voice of weeping went up in the silent offering of gratitude and joy; every spirit was lifted with his who led the way, until they were rapt into the pure and full light of the world he was entering. That spirit in very truth is putting on its vestments of light, and returning to its native skies. ‘It is, as it were, balancing its wings for its heavenward flight, to fold them not, till it shall bow before the throne of God!’

And when we see such a life closed and crowned by such a death, so entirely consistent, so delightfully consoling, we would not, we cannot conceal our satisfaction and gratitude. When we see a spirit like this thus awaking from the torpor of disease, praying earnestly for strength that it may spend its last breath here for the peace and virtue of those it had loved, then pouring itself out in strains of mighty eloquence for religion’s cause, fervent yet collected, glowing yet rational, with repeated petitions for strength and direction, leaving its solemn testimony—a testimony which life had borne, and on which death was now setting its seal—to the strength and victory of faith, to the power of that truth which came in no sudden flash, but had long guided and sustained—and at last soaring away in serenity and triumph on the wings of Jesus’ own prayer—when we see this, we must express the joy that it imparts; for it is consoling above all things else; it is rich in consolation, it is strong in assurance, it

is full of hope, sublime, immortal hope. We mention it not as a proof of doctrine; we vaunt it not to the world as a cause of sectarian triumph. Never. It is the triumph of religion, not of a sect. It is the power of principle, the strength of faith, the reality and glory of virtue, that we would exhibit. It is the full, clear, unsolicited, unequivocal, irresistible proof, that Christianity is not a fable, nor the peace it gives a mockery, nor immortality a dream. Many have died thus, we trust, of every name. We thank God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that it is so; and most fervently do we pray, that others may find the consolation that is given us. For now, in the recollection of this life and this death—and may they never be separated!—our murmurs are hushed, and gratitude mingles largely with the reverence in which we bow to the inscrutable decree. We feel that God has been good in giving and in taking away. We feel that much has been done for religion, for us, for all. We feel, in a word, that to die thus, is to live forever, receiving and dispensing blessing. It is not death, it is birth; the birth of the soul into its own bright and happy sphere. It is not the last, but the first hour of life and liberty. It is the dawn of immortality. The darkness of earth rolls away. The light of heaven breaks in upon the departing spirit, and the everlasting arms bear it home.

H.

 HEAVEN.

THE earth, all light and loveliness, in summer's golden hours,
 Smiles, in her bridal vesture clad, and crowned with festal flowers,
 So radiantly beautiful, so like to heaven above,
 We scarce can deem more fair that world of perfect bliss and love.

Is this a shadow faint and dim, of that which is to come?
 What shall the unveiled glories be, of our celestial home,
 Where waves the glorious tree of life, where streams of bliss gush
 free,
 And all is glowing in the light of immortality!

To see again the home of youth, when weary years have past,
 Serenely bright, as when we turned and looked upon it last;
 To hear the voice of love, to meet the rapturous embrace,
 To gaze through tears of gladness, on each dear familiar face—

Oh ! this indeed is joy, though here, we meet again to part.
But what transporting bliss awaits the pure and faithful heart,
Where it shall find the loved and lost, those who have gone before,
Where every tear is wiped away, where partings come no more !

When on Devotion's seraph wings, the spirit soars above,
And feels thy presence, Father ! Friend ! God of Eternal love !
Joys of the Earth ! ye fade away before that living ray,
Which gives to the rapt soul a glimpse of pure and perfect day—

A gleam of heaven's own light—though now its brightness scarce
appears,
Through the dim shadows, which are spread around this vale of
tears ;
But thine unclouded smile, O God ! fills that all glorious place,
Where we shall know as we are known, and see thee face to face !

A.

THE RITE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER A SYMBOLICAL
LANGUAGE.

TILL men arrive at a certain point in the progress of the mind, mysteries are, perhaps, necessary in religion. Beyond this point, nothing can be more injurious than mysteries. Up to this point, that is to say, while men are in a barbarous, or partially enlightened condition, reason is not sufficiently developed, and is not strong enough, to be the guide and controller of men's actions. The aid of imagination is needed ; perhaps it would not be too much to say that superstition is needed. Beyond the point in question, when men are enough enlightened to be spiritually, rationally, heartily interested in religion, mysteries are hostile to these characters of religious sentiment. They tend to make religion unreal and mechanical, or else to make men skeptical and distrustful about it. The mind demands to be satisfied on other subjects, and if it is turned away with unintelligible dogmas and ordinances in religion, it will be liable to relapse into indifference or infidelity. It may be laid down as a general principle, indeed, that the mind cannot be truly interested in what it does not understand. It may be interested *about* it ; it may have the most eager curiosity and desire to comprehend the mystery ; but this is not the rational and hearty interest in religion which may be expected of an improv-

ed age. Not, however, that any man can expect to understand everything in religion, everything concerning God, and futurity ; but, in order to be rationally interested, he must comprehend something ; and he cannot be rationally and truly interested in that part which he does not comprehend.

With these views I think it the duty of a religious teacher, among an intelligent people, to carry explanation as far as he is able. And, on this account, I propose to offer a few observations on *the distinctive character and peculiar import of the Lord's supper*. This, together with the general design of our Saviour's death, probably, remains in deeper mystery to most persons, than any other part of the christian ritual or doctrine.

In the first place, then, the rite of the Lord's supper is a language ; it is a symbolical language, and nothing else. It is simply and only a means of conveying certain ideas to the mind, and of awakening correspondent emotions in the heart. It is a '*showing forth* of the Lord's death.' 'This,' says our Saviour, 'this is, this *represents* my body broken for you ; this represents my blood shed for you.' That is to say, these symbols are a showing forth, an emblematic communication of these facts.

I know that it is common to say in general, that the communion service is significant of the death of Christ. But I must desire the reader to enter into some more careful discrimination of this assertion.—There are several kinds of language, or modes of expressing ideas. There is the expression of the countenance and gesture ; there are words, arbitrary or conventional signs of thought ; there are words taken in their simple sense ; and again there is a figurative language, the language of comparisons, analogies, images ; and in fine there is the language of symbols or emblems. This last, I have said, is the mode of communication adopted in the rite of the Lord's supper. It is a language, I repeat. It is no more mysterious than any other language. It is, in itself considered, no more solemn ; that is, unless it be for conveying more solemn thoughts.

But again, I say, that it does not convey more solemn thoughts, than those words which declare the passion, the patience, the meekness, and compassion of Jesus Christ. There is therefore no more reason, in the mode of communication, why we should have a feeling of constraint, or awe, or mystery, or seriousness, when we partake of the communion, than when we recount, in ever so simple and ordinary terms, the history of our Saviour's crucifixion. So far as the instrument is considered, it is just as solemn to read in the evangelist, the account of our Saviour's

passion, as it is to show it forth in the service of the communion ; I say, so far as the instrument of thought is by itself considered. Partaking of the communion is regarded in the light of a profession, I know, and in this view, it is more solemn. But it is not more solemn, regarded as a language, a showing forth of the Lord's death. That is to say, the bread and the wine, are no more solemn or mysterious things, than the words of the evangelical record, which declare the same matters of fact and faith. On the one hand, are emblems of thought ; on the other, are signs of thought.

Whoever looks for more than this, in the rite of the Lord's supper, I cannot hesitate to say, approaches it superstitiously ; for I desire any one to consider, what more there can be. Is there any secret virtue or efficacy in these emblems ? Certainly not. Does the use of them constitute any man a Christian ? Assuredly not. Does it tend to make any one a good man, or to procure for him the favor of God, but from the natural impression which it conveys of certain facts and truths to his mind ? Still we must answer, no. A man might as well imagine that, by partaking of one of our civic feasts, he were made a good citizen ; or by joining in the domestic festival of our Thanksgiving, he were inspired with the virtue of religious gratitude.

I say again, for I would fix this point, it is just as solemn, so far as the instrument of thought is concerned, to have the evangelical narrative of our Saviour's sufferings read to us, as to have it set forth in the Lord's supper. Why is it not ? The words of the narrative convey certain facts and truths to us ; the emblems convey no more. There are two kinds of communication, but the same subject matter. The vehicle of communication is not the great thing ; but the truth, the subject, the meek example, the heavenly patience, the divine forgiveness, the love stronger than death, that is set forth. These are the great things, the affecting matters, that are placed before us. And yet, I am afraid, there are many who look upon these symbols, 'weak and beggarly elements' as they are, in comparison with the solemn and glorious truths that are hidden under them—who look upon these external symbols with the chief awe, and who, although they have the gospel in their hands, and may at any time read and meditate on the glorious example and patient suffering of Christ, never think it necessary to be so solemn, or so much affected as at the communion. Ah ! the virtue is easy that is required to be in exercise but once a month, or during a few brief hours in the year. An easy thing it is, in these brief seasons, to lay up the merit, that shall last for days

and months to come—to say, ‘I have professed ; and I have partaken of the communion ; and I am a Christian.’ And mysteries always are easier to get along with than duties. And the tasks of superstition itself do not require such strenuous endeavours as the toils of virtue.

With the principle which has now been laid down, the simple principle that the rite of the Lord's Supper is a symbolical language, I wish to proceed a step further.

And I say, that as there is no mystery in this language, and should be no superstition in using it, or communicating with it, so should there be no superstitious or mystical notion of its *relative value*. As its meaning should not be mistaken, so neither should its power be overrated. Whatever force it may have had to the Oriental mind, to us, it is not so powerful as the language of words, as the living voice and countenance. It does not hold the same place in the christian system of means, as the written and preached word do, though our superstition may have exalted it to a higher. If we have exalted it higher, we have erroneously done so. We have no warrant from reason, or from the gospel, for conferring this distinction upon it. The language of the New Testament, is, not that men were to be saved by the power of the sacraments, but ‘by the foolishness of preaching,’ as the apostle modestly says. Preaching was the grand instrument ordained for the conversion of the world.

And it is reasonable to suppose, that man, the living instrument of divine power, the great agent on earth for the communication of divine truth, that man, with the ardent and glowing soul, which breaks forth in the words of exhortation, which flashes from the eye, which trembles on the lips, which speaks in the whole countenance—that man, embodied, intellectual, feeling, eloquent man, should have more power in the economy of the christian religion, than a collection of mere and simple, however solemn emblems.

And this, again, perfectly accords with experience. When the communion is administered, though the symbols are, indeed, affecting, yet they do, by no means, penetrate the heart so deeply as the fervent words of prayer and exhortation, that come from the heart of the minister at the altar. The symbols are solemn mementos, indeed—they bring solemn things to mind ; but it is the mind that must be quickened and touched to feel that these things are solemn ; and God and nature have ordained that the mind should be more powerfully addressed by language, by words that breathe out the soul, by this communion of heart with heart, than by any forms or emblems of things. This is

so true, that if the sacrament in question were celebrated in perfect silence, if there were nothing but this communion with symbols, I am certain it would become, compared with what it is now, a far less interesting service.

The position which I here maintain seems to me exceedingly clear and most evidently scriptural, and scarcely to need the earnestness of language with which I have urged it. That a man should be a more powerful instrument for conveying thought, than a symbol, would hardly seem to need to be formally stated. And let it be remembered that one is an appointed instrument as much as the other.

But although this position is so very evident, nothing is further from the views of the body of Christians. They have learnt from Popish abuses, to exalt the sacraments above every other form and instrument of religious power and sanctity. They imagine, that when the minister of religion goes from preaching the word, to the service of the communion, he goes from the less to the greater, from the more secular, to the more sacred. They imagine that he is then approaching what is most of all, solemn and awful. And I say that this is their superstition, a superstition which I am persuaded, did not exist in the earliest age, a superstition certainly unwarranted by our Saviour and his apostles. Visible symbols and rites at that period, were things of every day occurrence and use. Now they are uncommon. They are, therefore, strange to us ; we do not easily communicate with them ; and hence we are more liable to impressions of mystery and superstition.

And it is this superstition and this mystery that I would take away from the simple rite of the Lord's supper. I am persuaded, that they can do us no good. I know, both from experience and observation, that they do much hurt. This feeling of preternatural awe and mystery, makes the celebration of the Lord's supper, to many, a constrained and anxious service. I doubt not that there are multitudes who enter upon this service with pain and solicitude, and who feel relieved when it is concluded. What injury must a religious observance do, which is thus regarded !

I have been ready to ask, my reader, while I have been saying these things, Can you bear them ? They are true ; and why, then, should they not be declared to a community of intelligent Christians ? They are true ; and every man whose mind is at all disembarassed from traditional prepossessions, must see that they are true. I call upon Christians to be no more children in these matters, but men. I ask them, not to think lightly of

the communion—far, far from it—but I ask them to think soberly as they ought to think. The simple and spiritual views which I present of this ordinance, will not tend, in the slightest degree, to abate a true reverence for it, nor a calm and religious seriousness in the celebration of it.

I can think of no kindred solemnity that is fitted to awaken so deep an emotion as this. If there were a civic feast ordained in remembrance of that great and good man to whom we look, and to whom the eyes of all coming generations in this land shall look back, as the Father of his Country, I doubt not that, in the celebration of it, thousands among us would be touched with a filial reverence for his virtues and gratitude for his services. There would be no mystery, no superstition, but a simple and deep homage to his memory.

What, then, does it become us to feel, when celebrating, not the political saviour of a country, but the moral Saviour of the world? The remembrance which we cherish in this service, is of a more exalted virtue, of a more disinterested benevolence, of a more heavenly piety and patience, of an example and a suffering tending to more holy ends and issues, than all the annals of the world besides can furnish. There is no being that has lived on the earth, that ever shed such light upon my path, or opened to me such fountains of consolation, or held up to me such a glorious hope, as Jesus my Saviour has done. The benefits, which he communicates, were purchased with toil and privation, were sanctified by sufferings, and sealed in blood; and they are blessings transcending all that the world can bestow—blessings, spiritual, divine, immortal. For these things, no rites or vows of remembrance can be too solemn; no homage too reverential, no gratitude too profound, and affectionate, and constant. As often then as we eat the bread and drink the cup, let us show forth, with all affection and humanity, the remembrance of Christ; and let us ever show forth the same remembrance by the imitation of his virtues!

D.

REVIEW.

- ART. VII.—1. *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, with Resolutions passed at a Public Meeting held November 5, 1827.* Boston, N. S. Simpkins & Co. 1827. 12mo. pp. 21.
2. *Discourses on Intemperance, preached in the Church in Brattle Square, Boston, April 5, 1827, the Day of Annual Fast, and April 8, the Lord's Day following.* By JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M. Pastor of the Church in Brattle Square. Second Edition. Bowles & Dearborn. Boston. 1827. 18mo. pp. 111.
3. *First Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance.* Andover. 1828. 8vo. pp. 68.

THE great exertions that have been made in this country to repress intemperance during the last few years, cannot have escaped the observation of any one who is interested in the movements of the community. The causes which have contributed to produce the alarming prevalence of this evil, have been investigated and pointed out with great precision. The corporeal and mental diseases, the destruction and desolation which have attended its progress, have been exhibited with the most affecting eloquence, and its remedies have been diligently sought for, and presented to the public in the most practical forms. Societies have been formed, public meetings held, addresses delivered, tracts and newspaper essays circulated, to call forth, if possible, the whole moral strength of the country, to aid the cause of virtue.

Of the many publications on this subject, those named at the head of our article are among the most valuable. Mr Palfrey has collected, with great care, the statistics of intemperance, and painted the ruin and misery, which it entails on its victims and society, in glowing colors. Some of the calculations which he has introduced,—as the number of deaths produced by it, the number of persons injuriously affected by its prevalence, the quantity of ardent spirits consumed in the United States, and the amount of property wasted by it,—must startle even those who would fain be incredulous as to the extent of this national calamity. He has also given many valuable suggestions as to the modes in which the cure of the evil is to be attempted.

The Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, presents some of the causes of the general prevalence of this vice, and its remedies, in a more plain and tangible shape, than any publication we have seen. This Society has probably been the cause of much good by keeping the public mind continually awake to this subject. Its long continued and judicious exertions merit the highest gratitude of the community.

The Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, contains a great quantity of interesting matter, which deserves a wide circulation. The plan adopted by this society of having a secretary or general agent, to collect and publish information on the subject of intemperance, and to devote himself to promoting the cause of temperance, appears to us very judicious. We doubt not that this association is exerting a powerful and salutary influence on the public morals.

Though the subject is in a great degree worn and exhausted, and though we can hardly expect to arrive at any new conclusions concerning the causes, nature, and remedy of the disease, yet we believe it to be at all times useful to direct the public mind to it in every possible mode. As long as the evil continues to be alarming, the attention of the community ought not to be suffered to slumber, although little can be added to the weight of facts and arguments which have already been accumulated. What is now wanted, is not so much any new information, as to have what is already known widely diffused, and deeply impressed upon every individual.

It is gratifying to believe that the efforts which have been made to repress intemperance, have not been wholly in vain. It cannot, we think, be questioned, that the higher classes of society, in this part of the country, are more temperate than they were fifteen or twenty years ago. This has probably been occasioned, in a great degree, by the very prevalence of the vice, which has led educated and thinking men to beware of the first approaches of bad habits, and to inculcate on their children a salutary horror of their effects. They are evidently alarmed by the nature and extent of the evil which oppresses the country, and desirous of adopting any measures to diminish it. A change, too, has taken place in their opinions with regard to the use of distilled liquors. There are now fewer convivial meetings among these classes, and ardent spirits are in less common use. There is also reason to hope that a good impression has been made on the laboring classes; that many among them begin to find that spirits are not necessary as a stimulus to labor, but that they are

injurious, when taken habitually, even in moderate quantities. They are in consequence less used at times of labor, and less frequently offered as a mark of hospitality. In Boston the consumption of spirits has sensibly diminished within a few years, and the same is no doubt true of other parts of the country. The number of licenses in this place, which in 1822 amounted to 675, was in 1827 only 562, notwithstanding the great increase of population in the mean time. This is certainly a very encouraging result, and, though creditable to the government of the city, is chiefly to be ascribed to the change which has been taking place in public opinion. *

It may also be considered as an encouraging circumstance that societies have become common, throughout the country, of which the chief condition of membership is an entire abstinence from ardent spirits. Such associations must act powerfully on the morals, not only of the members themselves, but of all persons within the sphere of their example; and we hope to see them multiplied, particularly among the laboring classes, who are exposed to peculiar temptations from the present habits of society.

The causes of the excessive use of ardent spirits in the United States are well stated in the Report of the Massachusetts Society.

‘It seems now to be generally admitted, by those who have had an opportunity for observation, or have made themselves acquainted with the various facts which have been collected with regard to intemperance, that we are to attribute much of the prevalence of *immoderate drinking*, to the erroneous opinions and practices of society with regard to *moderate drinking*. No man, probably, ever became at once a drunkard. Drunkards have all once been *moderate* drinkers, and have only gradually and insensibly become *immoderate* drinkers. It would seem, then, that there must be something wrong in this habit of moderate drinking, since it leads, in so large a proportion of cases, to so deplorable a result.

‘What then is the origin of this custom of *moderate* drinking, which has prevailed so universally among the people of this country? Is it *merely* the cheapness of ardent spirits and the facility with which they may be obtained? These causes no doubt contribute most powerfully to convert moderate drinkers into drunkards; but not altogether to originate the custom of moderate drinking itself. Opium is a stimulus, to most persons very pleasant in its effects, not so dear as spirituous liquors, as easily obtained, and less injurious to health. Yet an opium eater is com-

* The following table shows the number of licenses granted in the city of Boston, during the last six years.

	1822	1823	1824	1825	1826	1827
Innholders	57	38	44	38	34	39
Victuallers	496	530	518	556	516	504
Retailers	113	103	65	43	17	17
Confectioners	9	8	3	5	5	2
	<hr/> 675	<hr/> 679	<hr/> 630	<hr/> 642	<hr/> 572	<hr/> 562

paratively rare, whilst the majority use spirits in some form and to some extent. If it be not the cheapness which has made the use of spirits on ordinary occasions so common, to what are we to attribute it? Principally, it is apprehended, to the opinion so generally entertained, that, when used in moderation, they are innocent or even salutary; that they are a necessary support during labor, and a protection against exposure to the inclemency of the weather and to bodily hardship of every kind. It is remarkable, to recur again to the illustration derived from opium, that those persons who have become persuaded that the moderate use of this drug is necessary to their health, their preservation from disease, or to the support of their sinking spirits, are liable to fall into its *excessive* use, exactly as *moderate* drinkers fall into the excessive use of ardent spirits. It is also to be remarked, that in those countries where opium is used as a stimulant, where it is as cheap, or cheaper than spirit with us, and as accessible to all classes of society, still opium eating does not become so common a vice, because the drug itself never ceases to be held in common opinion as a medicine or a poison.

‘This tends to show that the real ultimate difficulty lies in the estimation in which spirits are held, and in the custom which prevails with regard to them. Could we be taught to look on distilled spirits in the same light that we look upon opium, or even that the Turk looks upon opium, it is obvious that it could no longer be an article of *common* use, and it would in consequence cease to be abused by intemperate indulgence.’ pp. 5-6.

But it is not our present purpose to investigate the causes or nature of the disease under which our country is suffering, but merely to consider a few of the measures which have at different times been proposed to alleviate or remove it. Among these the diffusion of correct opinions, is among the most important, and is thus recommended in the Report from which we have just quoted.

‘It may be assumed as true, for it is supported by the most abundant evidence, and by the almost unanimous opinion of those whose pursuits give them the opportunity of observing, and whose profession the power of judging, that ardent spirits are not necessary to any individual even when undergoing the most severe bodily labor, but that on the whole they have rather a tendency to enfeeble him and unfit him for his task; that they are not necessary to protect him from the consequences of exposure to wet, cold, wind, &c., but that, on the contrary, they render him more liable to be unfavorably affected by such exposure; that, so far from being salutary when used in moderation, they are not even innocent, and that no man habitually indulges even in their moderate use, who does not, at some period of his life, suffer from their ill effects on his health and constitution. Now, could these truths be firmly fixed in the minds of men; could they in particular be firmly impressed upon the mind of every young person, so that he should grow up with them, and enter into life with them, it would almost follow of course that the custom of moderate drinking would gradually cease, and that of immoderate drinking, as a natural consequence, cease also.

‘The most distinct object, then, which presents itself to the minds of those engaged in the suppression and prevention of intemperance, is the dissemination of these opinions as widely as possible. If they are founded in truth, it can be made to appear so to the satisfaction of intelligent and respectable men, and gradually to the satisfaction of all. Not per-

haps in this generation, not perhaps in the next; for men seldom can be entirely divested of opinions and prejudices which they have acquired in their youth—but in the course of time it may be accomplished and will be accomplished.

‘These opinions are to be impressed on society by addressing the various classes of which it is composed, in a manner and form adapted to their different education, modes and habits of life. Strong and convincing statements should be made, for instance, of all the facts which tend to show that ardent spirits are not necessary to men engaged in labor. This is a point which lies at the very commencement of the undertaking. It is very difficult to convince even very temperate men, who have been brought up from boyhood, to labor, supported by ardent spirits, that it is possible for any man to labor hard without them; or even if they become convinced that they are not originally necessary, they still cling to the belief, that habit has made them indispensable to them. Still a thorough impression can be made upon some and a partial one upon many. If men can only be convinced that their sons will be the better for not drinking, though they may continue to believe that they themselves still require it, it is something gained. This impression is to be made by the circulation of publications, in tracts, newspapers, periodical works, &c., setting forth in various ways the groundlessness of the common opinions on this subject; showing that ardent spirits can communicate no strength; that the excitement they produce is followed by a corresponding exhaustion; that other kinds of drink, although they exhilarate less, enable the body much better to bear fatigue; stating the most striking cases in which hard labor has been endured, and great hardships encountered by those who have used no spirits, much better than by those who have, and contrasting the character and health of those who drink, with that of those who do not.

‘In connexion with statements of this kind, it should also be shown, that, while this practice is of no service to the laborer during his labor, it is, in the end, actually injurious to his health, by proving, as may be easily done, that *intemperance* in the use of ardent spirits is not necessary to their bad effects upon the health, spirits, and character; that the moderate drinker often brings upon himself disease and suffering, and falls a martyr to his habits; that no man can habitually use ardent spirits even in moderate quantities, without feeling sooner or later their sad effects, even though he may not be himself aware of the origin of those effects. The manner, also, in which ardent spirits produce such consequences might be dwelt upon; the symptoms by which the body is affected and disease indicated, detailed, and every man made to feel, in his own person, the consequences of indiscretion.’ pp. 6-8.

It is in the power of the medical profession, more than any other class of men, to diffuse correct information with regard to the effects of the use of ardent spirits on the human frame. And, though the opinions of physicians on this subject have been long known, still we think that the votes which have lately been passed by several medical societies, to discourage the use of these liquors, will have a great influence in correcting popular prejudice and practice. *

The power of societies in spreading correct opinions is great,

* The votes of several medical societies may be found in the Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance. pp. 38-40.

but the power of individuals is perhaps not less so. The most humble individual can always do something, by setting a good example. And those who have the direction of numbers of men and boys, as masters of vessels, superintendents of manufactories, and master mechanics, can do good to an extent which they would hardly believe without the experiment. This is very strikingly shown, in the letter of Mr Clowes, superintendent of the Rhode Island Coal Mines, which was published in our last number.

Much may be done to check intemperance by the mode in which children are educated. The good education, which all classes receive in this country, has no doubt a strong tendency to produce this effect. And though the moral character of individuals, is not always in direct proportion to their intellectual culture ; still it may be safely affirmed that a general diffusion of knowledge is favorable to virtue, and that in our own country those classes which are the best educated, are on the whole the most moral. With regard to this particular vice, the best educated classes, though far from being exempt from it, are much less addicted to it, than those whose education is more imperfect. Extending information of any kind among the laboring classes, must promote habits of temperance. It gives their minds new views, and new employments ; and thus the mechanics' institutions which are just beginning to be formed among us, will do much good, not merely by extending scientific information and promoting the progress of the arts, but by affording mechanics a delightful occupation for their leisure hours, and providing them with mental, in the place of sensual enjoyments.

But, although the diffusion of knowledge of any kind, will have a very beneficial tendency, yet much may be done by making temperance a specific object of attention in all places of instruction. The following remarks upon this topic, are from the Report from which we have already drawn so liberally.

‘There can be no doubt that the common and free use of ardent spirits in families, by parents and their friends, in the presence of their children, and by children, with the sanction or at least without the absolute disapprobation of their parents, tends very much to keep up, and extend the habit of moderate drinking. The impressions and associations, which are thus formed with regard to the use of these articles, are in their nature peculiarly difficult to remove ; and so far as they are concerned, we must trust chiefly to the influence which can be exercised through parents, and persons of adult age, who may become parents. Still there is room for the exercise of some direct influence upon the children themselves, through the books which are put into their hands, and the instruction they receive at school. Children are taught, in this way, that swearing, lying, and stealing, are criminal, and why may they not in the same way

be taught an early fear of the smallest indulgence in ardent spirits? It is true that this, like all their lessons of virtue, will be only too often counteracted by the examples which they witness at home; yet it is to be hoped that a strong favorable influence may be frequently exerted, and many saved by these early impressions from the dangers to which they are exposed.

‘In no places of education would lessons of this kind have so beneficial an influence, and into none would they seem so properly introduced, as into Sunday Schools. Perhaps the object might be sufficiently answered by their introduction to these schools alone, since they embrace so large a proportion of the children of all classes, and more particularly of those which are most immediately exposed to temptations to intemperance. And it is again proper to remark, that the lessons which are to be thus inculcated, are not to be primarily directed against intemperance. There is absolutely and originally no temptation to this vice, as there is to lying, swearing, &c.; the complete, thoroughly formed vice, is held in contempt by all. It is against the friendly, convivial, social habit of drinking, and the habit of drinking for refreshment and support, that the young are to be warned, rather than against the crime of intemperance. They are to be regularly and systematically taught the principle that entire abstinence is the only course that is consistent with temperance, and with that moderation which is necessary to a sound body and a sound mind.’ pp. 9-10.

We entirely coincide in these views. The strength and efficacy of early impressions, cannot be overrated. In the greater part of mankind they are the foundation of all their virtues. It is not to be supposed, that the child, when first told that he must not lie, and must not steal, feels very strongly the obligations of honesty and veracity. But the injunctions are again and again repeated; and, as he advances in years, an abhorrence of falsehood and dishonesty grows up with him, becomes the habit of his nature, and is, generally, far more powerful in regulating the conduct of the man, than any principles gained at a later period. In the same manner a love of temperance, and a horror of intemperance, if instilled in early youth, would be far more efficacious principles of conduct than if acquired in mature years. The virtues learned in advanced life, are too often like the frail and feeble blossoms which sometimes appear in autumn; if they do not fall in their very opening, their fruit perishes while it is yet green and immature.

We should be willing to go further than the Report. The laws of the Commonwealth now make it the duty of instructors of youth to impress on the minds of their pupils, a sacred regard to temperance. But we think it would be advisable to require by statute, that every public schoolmaster should make it a regular part of his duty, once in every week. The mode in which this instruction should be given, might very safely be left to the school committees, and schoolmasters. Though it would not be proper to legislate minutely on this subject, the course

which should be followed by schoolmasters is sufficiently obvious.

If the subject of temperance were thus to be made a regular part of the course of instruction in all our schools, it would tend to form in children, who have not the advantage of good instruction or example at home, that salutary aversion to ardent spirits which we now see in some persons whom nothing will induce to taste the smallest quantity. A great change in the character of the laboring classes might be effected by these means. Intemperance is the crying sin of our country. Against it we are directing all the powers of the pulpit and the press; and we should not neglect the still stronger power of early instruction. If, as has been asserted, we are a nation of drunkards, our character must be changed; and there is no power but education, which can produce the thorough reform which is required.

Another mode by which it has been proposed to diminish the use of ardent liquors, is to induce individuals to abandon the manufacture and sale of these poisons. Of late years the opinion seems to have been gradually gaining ground that the commerce in spirits is unjustifiable, and it has been stated as a fact, that 'merchants have already, in very considerable numbers, discontinued the sale of these articles, from conscientious motives.'* The moderate use of spirits, till within a short period, has been considered innocent by most people, and, by many, actually beneficial. But, it having been established by the concurrent voice of the medical profession that even the moderate use to persons in health, is not merely useless, but always dangerous, and generally pernicious, it seems difficult to resist the conclusion, however startling it may appear, that the traffic in spirits cannot be justified.

The common reply that we must not argue against the use of a thing merely from its abuse, will not serve in this case, where any use of the article, except as medicine, is injurious.

Though we may be well convinced of the sinfulness of this traffic, it does not by any means follow that those who are engaged in it are to be denounced. The distilling, vending, and importing of spirits have hitherto been considered reputable employments; and it is not to be expected that those engaged in them will, in a moment, be convinced of their impropriety. Being thus supported by their own and public opinion, it would not be either practicable or advisable for the national or state governments to take any measures to suppress these occupations.

* Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, p. 23.

Every man must judge of the lawfulness of engaging in them by the light of his own conscience. They cannot, we think, stand the test of the strict and searching morality of our religion. It is indeed hard to persuade a man to act against his present interest. But if the strict moralist is convinced that no use of spirits as an article of common drink, is justifiable, can he be satisfied that it is right to engage in preparing them or distributing them to the public for common use?

The only plausible argument by which any person can justify his aiding in preparing and distributing these destructive liquors to the public, is, that while the present taste for them continues, they will be distilled and sold, and that it makes no difference whether he does it, or some one else; that if he gives up his business, it will be merely sacrificing his profits for the benefit of his competitors, without doing any good to the public. We deny both the premises and the conclusion. It has always been thought a dangerous principle in morals to say, that a man may commit a crime, because the same evil would certainly result whether he had any agency in it or not. It is the same argument which Bonaparte used when he recommended poisoning the sick at Jaffa—the plague will certainly destroy them, therefore we may cut them off by opium. But it is needless to insist on the fallacy of a principle which no sound moralist will defend. Besides, we do not believe that no good would result from the voluntary abandonment of this business by persons engaged in it. There is no act so likely to produce a deep impression on the community, as the sacrifice of temporal interests from conscientious motives. It is a pledge of a man's sincerity which cannot be questioned, and gives the greatest weight to his opinions and example.

The striking analogy between this traffic and the slave trade, has been sometimes spoken of. Fifty years ago the slave trade was an important branch of English commerce. A large capital was employed in the business, and the buying and selling of human beings was sanctioned and encouraged by various acts of Parliament. During the preceding century a few unaided individuals here and there raised their voice against this nefarious traffic. But they seemed to speak to the winds; and at the period which we have mentioned, the greater part of the nation considered the attempt to abolish the slave trade as the height of insanity. A few years however elapse; the friends of humanity link themselves together; they exert themselves in Parliament. They are again and again defeated; but they rise from the ground with renewed vigor and confidence after every

overthrow, till at last the act for abolishing the slave trade is passed by an overwhelming majority. The man who should now attempt to sanction this traffic by law, would not obtain a hearing in the House of Commons. The course of public opinion on the same subject in our own country, has been similar. We mention the slave trade, because it affords a wonderful instance of the manner in which correct principles are gradually formed and fixed in the public mind, and because the arguments formerly used to justify it are very similar to those advanced in defence of the traffic in spirits. Thus, it is said that a great capital is invested in distilleries, in importing molasses and spirits, and that a great multitude of people are employed in raising grain for the distilleries. So in support of the slave trade, it was formerly urged that it employed a great number of men and a large capital. But the argument is fallacious. This capital and labor are engaged in preparing ruin and misery for the country. The great amount of capital, and the great number of persons employed in the business, do not at all change its character. If it would be unjust to hire an army of ten thousand men, who would otherwise be unemployed, to lay waste the territories of an unoffending nation, would it be more just to employ an army of a hundred thousand for the same purpose? Yet the cases are parallel; except that the injury done to the country by preparing and distributing spirits among the people, is beyond comparison greater than any which could be done by an invading army of a hundred thousand men, and there is no reason to believe that our whole nation might not be usefully employed, even if the use of spirits were entirely given up. If a person publishes a grossly licentious or irreligious book, he is subject to punishment as a criminal. Yet he might argue that he supported himself and several other persons by printing this book. Every one sees that this is no justification. And yet we think few would dare to say that the injury likely to arise to society from a free trade in immoral books, would be greater than that arising from the preparing and vending spirituous liquors.

It is often said, that nothing can be done by the laws to repress intemperance, that the remedy must be a moral one. But this is a very loose and incorrect assertion, and is no more true with regard to intemperance than many other objects of the law. It is true that unless the laws are aided by the moral force of the community they are vain and impotent. But to say that nothing can be done by law, is as idle as to assert that towers and walls are no protection to a city, because they require soldiers to man them. The moral force of the community is in-

deed required, in all its strength, to check this growing evil ; but there is no mode in which it can act more effectually than in making good laws, and aiding in enforcing them.

If laws alone, however, could stay the progress of intemperance, it had long since ceased in Massachusetts. There is perhaps no vice which our fathers aimed so constantly to restrain. But the statutes having this object are so frequent, that we are led to fear that all their efforts were ineffectual ; a conclusion fully supported by the present state of the country. It would be of little use to enumerate the great variety of provisions contained in these acts, as the legislation on this subject, under the colonial and provincial governments, was generally of a similar character to that which has been pursued by the Commonwealth, and the particulars in which their legislation differed from ours, are not of a character to be imitated in the present state of manners and opinions. Innkeepers and retailers were required to be licensed, and were punishable if they permitted excessive drinking in their houses, while individuals guilty of drunkenness were liable to be punished as criminals for every offence. The provincial statutes relating to licenses and licensed houses, with very slight modifications, are the same with those now in force in the Commonwealth ; and the colonial statutes exhibit the rude outlines of the same system. The following specimens of our early legislation, will probably satisfy most of our readers.

‘ No person or persons, having license to keep a common house of entertainment, shall suffer any person, or persons, at unseasonable times, to drink or tiddle in their houses, upon pain to forfeit for every time, for each person so tipping, five shillings ; and it is declared to be unseasonable times any time after nine of the clock.’ *

‘ If any person offend in drunkenness, excessive or long drinking, the second time, they shall pay double fines. And if they fall into the same offence the third time, they shall pay treble the fines, and if the parties be not able to pay the fines, then he that is found drunk, shall be punished with whipping to the number of ten stripes, and he that offends in excessive or long drinking, shall be put into the stocks for three hours, when the weather may not hazard his life or limbs.’ †

A law of the Province, passed in 1693, provides that certain offenders, among whom drunkards are enumerated, if they are unable to pay the fines which are set on their offences, may be

* September 1646. Col. and Prov. Laws, Ed. 1814, p. 136.

† Col. and Prov. Laws, 137.

punished 'by setting in the stocks, or putting into the cage, not exceeding three hours, or imprisonment twentyfour hours, or by whipping not exceeding ten stripes, as the case may deserve.' *

As few persons who are not actively engaged in the administration of the laws, are acquainted with the great variety of statutes in Massachusetts, which have the repression of intemperance for their object, we have thought that it might not be uninteresting to present a sketch of the most important provisions of those which are now in force.

No person who is not licensed, can be a common victualler, innholder, or seller of wine, beer, ale, brandy, rum, or any strong liquors by retail, or in a less quantity than twentyeight gallons, under penalty of twenty pounds. And any person selling at any time, any spirituous liquors, or any mixed liquors, part of which is spirituous, without license therefor, forfeits for each offence, not more than six pounds, nor less than forty shillings. †

There are several sorts of licenses, such as the victualler's, the innholder's, and the retailer's. The innholder and victualler's licenses, give the right of selling spirituous liquors to be drunk in their houses. The retailer's license, only gives the right of selling spirits in small quantities, but he is prohibited from allowing them to be drunk in his shop, and if he allow them to be drunk in his shop, he is subject to the same penalties as if he sold without a license. ‡

All these licenses are obtained in the same manner. They are granted by the Court of Sessions on the application of the parties. But no license is originally granted to any person unless he obtains a certificate from the selectmen that he is a person of sober life and conversation, and suitably qualified for the business. All licenses must be renewed every year; and they are only renewed to those persons of whom the selectmen certify that they have maintained good rule and order in their respective houses and shops, and have conformed to the laws respecting licensed persons. §

The selectmen of each town are also required to certify to the Court of Sessions, every year previously to their term for granting licenses, which is the first court after the last Tuesday in June, the number of innholders and retailers in their respective towns which they judge to be necessary for the public good. ||

* Col. and Prov. Laws, 259.

† Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 1.

‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 4.

§ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 2.

|| Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 2.

And the Court of Sessions are directed by law not to license more persons in any town to keep public houses, or retail spirits than the justices shall judge necessary for the receiving and refreshing of travellers and strangers, and to serve the public occasions of each town, or necessary for the public good. *

Every person licensed as an innholder, victualler, or retailer, is required to pay for his license, besides the fees, a duty of four dollars. †

He is also obliged to become bound to the Commonwealth in twenty pounds, as principal, with two sureties in ten pounds each, for observing the laws which affect him as a licensed person. ‡

In Boston, the whole power of granting licenses is vested in the Mayor and Aldermen. In granting licenses, they are authorized to annex thereto such reasonable conditions in regard to time, place, and other circumstances, as, in their judgment, the peace, quiet, and good order of the city may require. The Mayor and Alderman have also a discretionary power to revoke or suspend any license. §

Every innholder, or victualler, is prohibited from suffering any person to drink to excess in his house, or suffering any minors, or servants, travellers excepted, to sit drinking, or to have any strong drink there, without special license from their respective parents, guardians, or masters, on penalty of twenty shillings. ||

On a second breach of the act, he must, besides paying the penalty, recognise for his good behaviour for one year, with two sufficient sureties, and on a third breach forfeits his license, which cannot be renewed for three years. ¶

The selectmen in every town are required to have posted up in the houses and shops of all innholders and retailers within their town, a list of all reputed common drunkards or common tipplers, mispending their time and estate, in such houses. And every keeper of such house or shop, who, after such notice, is convicted of entertaining any of the persons named in such list, or permitting them to drink in his house, or selling them spirituous liquor, is liable to forfeit thirty shillings. **

Whenever any person, by idleness or excessive drinking, so wastes or lessens his estate, as to expose himself or his family to want, or the town to which he belongs to expense for maintaining him or his family, or shall indulge in spirituous liquors, so as to injure or endanger his health, the selectmen of the town are

* Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 15. † Mass. st. 1795, c. 80, s. 1. 1819, c. 131, s. 1.

‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 10.

§ Mass. st. 1821, c. 110, s. 13.

|| Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 7.

¶ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 8.

** Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 16.

required in writing under their hands to forbid all licensed persons in their town, and in any town to which he resorts, to sell him any strong liquor for one year. This prohibition is to be renewed if he does not reform within the year. Any licensed person selling any strong liquor to such prohibited person is liable to a fine of twenty shillings. * And any person purchasing, procuring, or selling, or causing to be purchased, procured, or sold, any strong liquors for the use of such prohibited person, is liable to forfeit ten dollars. †

Any innholder, retailer, or victualler giving credit to any person inhabiting the town where he is trusted, or residing within five miles distance, for victuals and drink for more than ten shillings, is liable by statute to lose the whole amount so trusted, and all actions for such debts are barred. ‡

The law makes it the duty of tithingmen to inspect carefully all licensed houses, and to inform of all disorders or misdemeanours which they shall discover or know to be committed therein, as also of all such as sell spirituous liquors without license. §

Any innholder, victualler, or retailer, suffering any minor, tippler, or common drunkard, to remain in his house or store, or furnishing them with any strong liquor, is liable to a fine of ten dollars, and to forfeit his license, which is not to be renewed for three years. ||

No victualler or innholder is allowed to entertain any persons, except travellers or lodgers, or suffer them to be on his premises drinking on Sunday, under penalty of ten shillings for each person so entertained or suffered; and every person so drinking or abiding is liable to be fined from five shillings to ten shillings. On every conviction after the first, the licensed person pays twenty shillings, and for the third offence loses his license, which cannot be renewed for three years. ¶

Prisoners confined in jail, either on conviction and sentence for any crime, or upon charge of any crime before conviction, are not allowed to have or drink any spirituous liquor, except it is ordered by the attending physician. Any jailer suffering such prisoners to have or drink any spirit, forfeits twenty five dollars for the first offence, and fifty dollars for the second, besides being removed from his office, and is rendered incapable of holding the office of sheriff, deputy sheriff, or jailer, for five years. **

* Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 17.

† Mass. st. 1818, c. 65, s. 1.

‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 18.

§ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 19.

|| Mass. st. 1818, c. 65, s. 2.

¶ Mass. st. 1791, c. 58, s. 3.

** Mass. st. 1817, c. 149, s. 3, 4.

Common drunkards are liable to be sent to the House of Correction. *

Intemperate persons wasting their estate, are liable to be put under guardianship. †

We have thus stated the statutes of this State which are intended to repress intemperance, as the first step to an improvement in the laws, though too often forgotten by our lawgivers, is, to understand those which are now in operation. The present system for regulating the sale of spirits, and the management of licensed houses, seems on paper to be excellent. Requiring every licensed person to produce a certificate of good character and good conduct from the selectmen, every year, ought, one would think, to confine licenses to proper persons; while the minute regulations for the good order of licensed houses and shops, the restricting their number to what is necessary for the public good, and prohibiting retailers from having ardent liquors drank on their premises, appear to present obstacles in the way of intemperance not easily to be surmounted. But there is reason to fear that some of these statutes are practically a dead letter; that any person can get a certificate of good character, where it is not notoriously and outrageously bad; that very little attempt is made to regulate the number of licensed persons by the rule of the public good, and we know that retailers of spirits very frequently allow liquors to be drunk on their premises. We do not undertake to say that any one is to blame because these laws are not better enforced. It may be that from the state of society it is morally impossible to enforce them; and it may be that some of them require that sort of paternal vigilance in the selectmen and other authorities, which is only practicable in very small communities.

Though the laws for punishing intemperate persons by sending them to the house of correction and putting them under guardianship, are very proper regulations for taking care of troublesome persons, they have but a slight tendency to check intemperance. Those who are exposed to these punishments are generally too far advanced in bad habits to be reformed by them; and the fear of the disgraceful punishments which await the last stages of vice, seldom enters into the consideration of those who are just commencing the career of intemperance. No man, until his habits are too much strengthened to be broken by any common force, thinks for a single moment of the possibility that he may ever suffer punishment as a confirmed drunkard. Indeed, if the prospect of disgrace and ruin, which are the sure

* Mass. st. 1787, c. 54, s. 2.

† Mass. st. 1783, c. 38, s. 7.

consequences of habitual intemperance, will not deter men from vicious indulgence they cannot be moved by the dread of any penalties which may be provided by legislative enactments.

It has been sometimes recommended to make every act of drunkenness punishable as a crime in the manner our forefathers did. But, without entering into the inquiry as to the cases in which society has a right to visit personal vices by public punishments, there seem some obvious objections to such a course. In the first place a law of the kind proposed would be imperfectly executed. The acquaintances and relations of offenders would rarely consent to complain against them, and the community at large would feel a great reluctance, except in very gross cases, to have any punishment inflicted for such offences.

But even in cases in which the law would be executed, we doubt whether it would have the desired effect, either in reforming the offenders, or in deterring others from the same excesses. If the persons convicted of acts of drunkenness be confirmed drunkards, no one can have the smallest hope that they would be reformed by any punishment. If they are just entering on habits of excess, and this indeed is the only class on which the law could be expected to have any effect, we believe that at least as many would be hardened and confirmed in their vicious courses, by the shame and disgrace of public exposure, as would be reformed. With regard to men of good character and sobriety, who might be inadvertently led into a single act of excess, any punishment in a court of justice would be too severe.

Nor do we think that punishing single acts of intemperance, would have any efficacy as an example to deter others. If, as we have said before, the terrible consequences of indulgence in ardent liquors, which are even now obvious to the most ignorant, and obtrude themselves on the most unobservant, will not deter men from vicious courses, the dread of a slight punishment can have no influence.

It seems to us, therefore, that nothing could be gained by increasing the punishments of drunkenness, and that the statutes regulating licensed persons, do not require any essential amendments. The laws, to reach the evil, must attack it in its early stages, before bad habits are formed and strengthened. If we regard the causes which mainly contribute to form these habits, we shall see at once the place to which the remedy should be applied. It is evident that among the chief causes of the prevalence of intemperance in this country, are the cheapness of strong liquors, and the numerous facilities which are given to indulgence in them. In our large cities there is a dram shop at

every corner. Those who are forming a taste for spirits are solicited at every turn. And the price which they are required to pay is so small, that it is no wonder so many are unable to resist the temptation. Nothing therefore would check intemperance so much as to increase the price of spirits, and diminish the number of places at which the poison may be drunk. Both of these objects probably, but certainly the latter, would be promoted by increasing the price of licenses. The sum of four dollars, now required to be paid, is so small as to be within the means of almost any person. Let it be raised to twenty, thirty, or fifty dollars, and the number of persons applying for licenses would be very sensibly reduced. In New York an excise duty of from five to fifty dollars, at the discretion of the commissioner, is required from every person licensed to retail spirits in the city of New York, and from five to thirty dollars in other parts of the State. We should, however, be in favor of an invariable sum, as fifty dollars for Boston, and twenty-five dollars for other parts of the State. That the proposed measure would have the effect of diminishing the number of licensed houses, is evident from the effect of the United States law laying a duty on licenses. The duties imposed by this law varied from ten to twentyfive dollars.* Mr Palfrey states that 'in three years from the beginning of 1814, after which the internal duty levied by the general government became payable, fewer licenses by far were taken out in the counties of Suffolk and Essex, than in the years before and since, and there is no reason to doubt that the same was the consequence elsewhere.'†

It is worthy of remark, that for a long course of years under the colonial and provincial governments, every retailer was obliged to pay an excise duty of 50s. for every butt of wine sold by him at retail, and 2*d.* a quart on all strong waters. This law, it is believed, continued in force until after the revolution. It must, we should think, have operated as a far heavier tax than that now proposed.

To give full effect to a law of the kind proposed, the societies for the suppression of intemperance might make it a part of the duty of the members, to see that the laws against retailing spirits without license, and prohibiting retailers from allowing spirits to be drunk in their shops, are duly enforced. It would be easy for a certain number of members to act as a committee for this purpose, for a limited district, as for a town or part of a town in

* Acts of 13th Congress, c. 38. s. 4—4 U. S. Laws, Bioren's Ed. 613.

† p. 85.

the country, and for a ward or part of a ward, in Boston. These members should agree to prosecute all offenders in the particulars abovementioned, within the limits assigned them, the expenses attending such prosecutions to be defrayed from the funds of the society, and any fines received by the prosecutors to be for the use of the society. We believe that there is virtue enough in the community to support and encourage any attempts of this kind. The labor on any individual would not be very oppressive, especially if proper exertions were made to secure a sufficient number of members for such associations.

Another means of checking intemperance by increasing the price of spirits, which is often spoken of, is laying an excise duty on all spirits of domestic manufacture. We are aware that many persons of great respectability believe this will have no tendency to produce the desired effect, unless the duty be enormously high, and that a very high duty would encourage the illicit manufacture of the article. We allow that an excessive duty ought not to be laid, because it might have this consequence; but we still think that a moderate one would produce a beneficial effect, and however small this effect may be, still it is desirable. It ought besides to be recollected that the duty paid on a gallon of whiskey, will increase the price of the article at retail more than the amount of the duty; for the distiller must have his profit upon the excise as well as upon every other part of the cost of production, and every other hand through which the article passes to the consumer, must receive a like profit. But that a duty, however slight, will effectually diminish the quantity of the article consumed, will not be doubted by those who have observed the immediate and decided reduction of consumption, in articles of general use, which often takes place, as soon as the duty upon them is raised, however slightly. The barometer shows the pressure of the atmosphere scarcely more instantaneously and certainly, than consumption does the pressure of taxation. It is true that where the tax is light, there may be few people who would be unable to use the same quantity of the taxed article which they had done previously. But the increased price of any article of general consumption, always induces people to economize in it, while a low price renders them lavish in its use. It has often happened in Great Britain, that when the duty on an article was increased, not only was there less of that article consumed, but a less quantity of money was spent upon it than there was before the increase of duty; and that a reduction of the duty has produced an increased revenue, partly, no doubt, in consequence of the check given to smug-

gling by diminishing its profits, but probably in a great degree from increased consumption.

It will no doubt be said, that this is an odious tax, and will not be endured; that we should yield to the prejudices of the people, and not resist them. But we cannot acquiesce in this reasoning. It is the duty of every enlightened legislature to protect the people from their own ignorance and folly, to resist the current of popular feeling. It is not for Congress to inquire whether all classes of people will be pleased to have an excise on spirits, whether the distillers and drinkers of rum and whiskey will be the advocates of such a measure; but merely whether it can be carried into operation so as to promote the public welfare. The experiment has been twice tried, and both times successfully. In 1791 a statute was passed laying a duty on spirits distilled in the United States. These excise duties, modified by various statutes, were levied until 1802, when all the statutes on the subject were repealed. In 1813 an act was passed for laying duties on licenses to distil spirituous liquors, in proportion to the capacity of the still; and at the end of 1814, a duty of twenty cents a gallon was laid on all spirits distilled in the United States, in addition to the duty on licenses. These duties ceased at the end of the year 1817.*

It is much to be regretted that these acts have been repealed, it is so difficult to pass any new laws on such a subject, and to put a new system in operation. Even those who are doubtful whether any excise on ardent spirits will produce the good moral effect which is expected, would, we should think, be in favor of introducing it, that the experiment may be fairly tried. There surely can be no more suitable object of taxation for the sake of revenue than ardent spirits. They are a luxury, and a luxury of the worst kind. The large revenue, which can unquestionably be raised from this duty, without injury or inconvenience, should be decisive in its favor.

It is however said, with great seriousness and by men in high station, that domestic spirits ought not to be taxed, because it

* Our limits do not permit us to give a full statement of all the statutes on this subject passed by the United States. The duties by the statute of 1791 varied from nine to thirty cents a gallon, according to the proof, and their being distilled from domestic or foreign materials. In 1792, by a new act, the duties were made from seven to twentyfive cents a gallon. By the act of 1814 the duty paid for licenses for stills employed on domestic materials, was \$1.08 a year, which in 1816 was raised to \$2.16, for each gallon of the capacity of the still, and for those employed on foreign materials \$1.35, which in 1816 was raised to \$2.70. The duty was proportionally higher for shorter periods. A particular account of these statutes, and of the revenues raised by them, may be found in Seybert's Statistics, p. 455 to 464.

would discourage national industry and injure the agricultural interest. As if the pecuniary interest of one part of the community, was to be weighed against the lives and morals of another part! As if the manufacture of poison was to be encouraged for the benefit of agriculture!

We might enlarge on the subject before us, but we have already trespassed beyond the limits we had at first assigned to ourselves. That the great efforts which have been made, and are still making, throughout our country, to promote temperance, will produce a deep and lasting good impression, seems to us certain. To those, however, who feel doubtful of success in this cause, we recommend the following extract from the last of Mr Palfrey's Discourses.

'In presuming to suggest remedies, my friends, I have by no means overlooked or underrated the difficulties of the case. But I also remember, that difficulties are the instituted occasion in the order of Providence for calling out great wisdom and vigor. I call to mind words of the president of that society to which I have referred as successfully labouring in this cause;* a great and good man, whose devotions were used to ascend here with yours for a divine blessing on all good counsels and all just works, and whose heart, I doubt not, was often warmed with yours by the breathings of love to God and man, which then fell here from most persuasive lips. He had this cause much at heart. His large and earnest mind counted the obstacles, but it was the better to meet them. "As the object is good," said he, "so it is practicable." I love to repeat that saying. *The object is good; therefore it is practicable.* It is an enterprise against that which is, by eminence, the misfortune, the danger of our beloved country; the blot on the fair works of God among us; the weapon of the prince of darkness. It has a right then to the services of every prudent man, every patriotic citizen, every disciple of Christ; and it asks the benefit of no other services than those, effectually to maintain itself. I desire more and more to realize, for it is a truth which all religion establishes, and all future experience is to seal, that under the government of a God who hath pleasure in righteousness and favor for its toils, single minded men need no other omen for the conquest, in due time, over any difficulties, than the omen of A GOOD CAUSE.' pp. 109-111.

We hope hereafter to discuss some other topics connected with the subject that we have been considering, which will give us an opportunity to notice other important publications respecting intemperance, besides those named at the head of this article.

* 'The late Honorable Samuel Dexter.'

ART. VIII.—1. *The Future Punishment of Infants not a Doctrine of Calvinism*; 2. *The Future Punishment of Infants never a Doctrine of the Calvinistic Churches*; 3. *On the Future State of Infants*;—three Letters addressed 'To the Editor of the *Christian Examiner*, and published in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for January, February, and March. By the Rev. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 43.

IN our number for September and October last we published an article upon a note of Dr Beecher's respecting the Calvinistic doctrine of infant damnation, to which he has in these Letters attempted an answer. 'In the article before me,' he tells us, 'I seem to the writer to have made statements, which put me out of the pale of reputable controversy, and which if not done ignorantly, must leave a deep stain upon my character.' We are glad to find one sentence of his, in which he has neither perverted our meaning, nor misconceived what may be the issue of this discussion. But the exception in favor of his ignorance, which we made at first, we cannot in conscience make now. Indeed, we are disposed to think we were wrong to make it at all. In that note he accused us, and all, who charge upon Calvinism and approved Calvinistic writers 'the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned,' of propagating a slander—a bearing of false witness against neighbours. Now if Dr Beecher did not know, that such writers nevertheless do expressly maintain that doctrine, and defend it as an essential part of the Calvinistic system, his bold accusation of those better informed, accompanied with an acknowledgement that he had not examined the point, might admit of some apology. What strikes our own minds as 'monstrous,' it is very hard to believe can appear in a totally different light to those with whom we are 'conversant;' and a zeal for the honor of one's intimates, in itself so commendable, might find pardon for a few hasty words intended to relieve them of a false and injurious imputation. But when irresistible evidence that the imputation is just, may be had for the asking; when, to come directly to the case before us, Dr Beecher had only to turn over a few standard Calvinistic authors to be satisfied, on their own testimony, that they have not, as he imprudently asserts, been misrepresented, holding expressly that infants, dying without actual transgression, are yet damned to all eternity for their original sin—in such circumstances to call names, and that too

with a great show of deliberation, and a great parade of competency to speak authoritatively on the subject, is utterly unpardonable. Ignorance, instead of an excuse, becomes, in such case, a chief part of the crime. Unknowingly to make a false statement, and to attack the reputation of others on the pretence of accurate and laboriously collected evidence of its truth, when no such evidence is produced or even exists, in our estimation differs but little, in point of moral character, from denying what we know to be true.

Still, the papers before us require at our hands some kind of attention. The author's palpable attempts to evade the question at issue by a frequent and fretful shifting of positions, his suppressing of passages or clauses material to a just representation of the real sentiments of the writer he is quoting, his lofty pretensions to extensive reading in theology unsupported by the least evidence of learning, and, above all, the unblushing dogmatism that throughout characterizes these extraordinary productions,—these things, though sure to find their just estimation with such as are accustomed to abstract reasonings, or are possessed of the scantiest share of theological knowledge, may yet impose upon the ill informed, and lead them to conclusions essentially false and mischievous. Bold assertions, even against the evidence of notorious facts, especially if made by a minister of Christ, are, by their very boldness, well fitted to silence doubts and prevent investigation. The office of the man carries with it something of the holiness and authority of the Teacher sent from God whose servant he professes to be, and that often too readily passes for true, which all are prompt to say, ought not to be false. With this apology—for we think an apology necessary—we shall occupy as few pages as possible with a reply to these writings, out of the pale of reputable controversy though the writer has put himself, and seems inclined, should his statements prove to be false, to admit himself to be.

The Letters present us with so many matters irrelevant to the subject they presume to discuss, that it is necessary to settle clearly at the outset, what is the precise point in dispute. The history of the case is this. In 1808 Mr Beecher delivered a sermon on the Government of God, in which he incidentally combatted the doctrine of Calvin and his followers, that the number of the saved bears a small proportion to that of the damned; a doctrine, which has always been matter of reproach to his party, and from the odium of which it is very natural that such as suffer themselves to be called Calvinists,

without well knowing what Calvinism is, should wish to be freed. Nineteen years elapse, and Dr Beecher finds the people dissatisfied with another 'monstrous' doctrine of the same school, and, not content, as in the former instance, with merely giving his own views of the subject, he ventures to speak in behalf of the whole Calvinistic party of past and present times, and on putting his sermon to the press for the seventh time, adds for the first time, the note which has occasioned this controversy, and which we shall once more transcribe for our readers. It is as follows;—

'I am aware that Calvinists are represented as believing, and teaching, the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones. But having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of the most distinguished Calvinistic divines in New-England, and in the middle and southern and western States, I must say, that I have never seen nor heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man, minister, or layman, who believed or taught it. And I feel authorised to say, that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them. And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons, who have been accustomed to propagate this slander, that they commit to memory, without delay, the ninth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false-witness against thy neighbor."'

Acknowledging ourselves to be implicated in this serious charge of falsehood and slander, we attempted a defence, in which we took the plain and obvious meaning of the note to be that, according to its author, 'the doctrine of infant damnation is no part of the Calvinistic scheme, and has not been maintained in any respectable Calvinistic book, which Dr Beecher may reasonably be supposed to have seen or heard of, though he has been for thirty years conversant with Calvinistic writers the most approved.'* The correctness of this representation of his meaning Dr Beecher has not called in question, for the simple reason that he could not. In direct contradiction of these positions, we made it our object to produce 'authorities for asserting, that, notwithstanding Dr Beecher's formal, and, considering all circumstances, his solemn disavowal and denial, the doctrine of infant damnation has been expressly maintained by leading Calvinists, and is connected with essential, vital principles of the Calvinistic system.'† Such was the question then, and such is the question now;—Has the 'monstrous doctrine that infants are damned' been held by approved Calvinistic writers? Is it a part of the Calvinistic system? Yet he

* Christian Examiner, Vol. iv. p. 448.

† Ibid. p. 431.

who should read only the Letters before us, would think our chief object had been, to fix upon the living Calvinists of Boston, of New England, or of the United States, 'the odium,' as Dr Beecher calls it, of believing what we have shown to be a Calvinistic doctrine. He is so fearful that we shall be tempted to deny this, however, that he enters into a labored argument to prove it—a step, the very necessity of which is sufficient evidence that such could not have been the case. The leading object of a writer not too contemptible for the notice of so able a logician and accomplished a scholar as Dr Beecher has shown himself to be, cannot have been left a matter of doubtful inference from a detached sentence or two, but must have been put, on every page and in every line, beyond the possibility of misapprehension, and consequently beyond the necessity of argumentative proof. Although it is therefore not easy to conceive that he did not see, as distinctly as we endeavoured to make it appear, what our purpose really was, we can without difficulty account for his misrepresentation of it. Our quotations from 'approved Calvinistic writers' left him in reality but one alternative. He must either acknowledge that he had ignorantly published an indefensible charge of falsehood and slander upon the pretence of a thorough examination of evidence which he had never seen, or confess that that charge was made against his better knowledge;—a dilemma upon the horns of which it must be agonizing to be tossed, but from the one or the other of them there is so little possibility of escape, that he betrays a very natural anxiety to avail himself of the best ground on which to try his skill at evasion. Hence this array of 'living Calvinistic men.' It is a mere attempt to decoy his antagonist to another and more promising part of the field. Printed documents can hardly be made to say one thing, when they have once said another. It is not so with unwritten opinions. Their meaning is variable, and can be made to vary. Besides, the recorded page is accessible to all; the unrecorded opinion, only to a few. It is no wonder, then, that Dr Beecher, if distrustful of the testimony of books, should wish to discredit its value, and show himself fearful lest we collect our evidence against him exclusively from the dead, to the neglect of the living. Considerations like these, we say, were doubtless sufficient inducements, and we can hardly conceive of any others he could have had, for attempting to change the whole bearing of the controversy, and make it turn, not upon the question of fact respecting the teachings of approved Calvinistic writers, but upon the more doubtful one respecting the opinions of living Calvinists.

But how is Dr Beecher's object endeavoured to be accomplished? What is his argument for proving that we really meant one thing, when we have so explicitly asserted, and so constantly made it appear, that we meant quite another?—It is contained in the following extract, to which, and especially to the first paragraph, we ask the reader's particular attention.

'The whole stress of my disclaimer in the note,' he says, 'respects not the dead, but the living. The offence stated is, that I have never seen a man, neither minister nor layman, who believed or taught the doctrine. And the reference to the "most approved Calvinistic writers," was not primarily for the purpose of vindicating the dead from unjust aspersion, though this would have been a duty [?], but to vindicate the living; to disencumber myself and my brethren, and the whole Calvinistic body in New England, and the United States, of the odium attached to us by the circulation of such a falsehood. The not having met with the sentiment in the most approved Calvinistic writers is alleged in proof that it is not a sentiment adopted by Calvinists of the present day, upon the principle, that if the most approved writers do not teach it, and a living man had not been found by me who believed or taught it, the imputation must be a slander. And when, upon these grounds, I proceeded to state my disclaimer, it had, as my complaint had, exclusive reference to the living. It is that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them. And my closing exhortation that those who had circulated the slander, that Calvinists hold to the doctrine that infants are damned, should commit to memory without delay the ninth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," was upon the supposition that the neighbors whom they slandered were living Calvinists, and not the dead of other ages.

'In this manner, I am happy to perceive the reviewer understood me. For he says,* "If Dr Beecher had merely told us *he* thought the doctrine of infant damnation a false one, that *he* did not believe it, and they who say *he* does believe it, bear false witness against their neighbor, our remarks and citations would have been spared. But to deny it in the name of a party, whose most accredited organ he would fain be considered; to deny it in the name of the most approved writers, who expressly state it, and, in some instances seem almost to think it a slander to be said not to hold it; and for him impudently to accuse those who, with us, charge it upon those writers and their system, of a breach of the commands of their God; this has rendered it our bounden duty to appear in self-defence."

'Now, though the reviewer, in summing up his charge against me, shrinks from the responsibility of charging the Calvinistic party directly, and in so many words, with holding the doctrine of infant damnation, and lets the charge slide off upon "those writers and their system," yet we are not to be deceived by such finesse, for he does declare that the system, which living Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned; and he does give as one reason for its being his bounden duty to appear in self-defence, that I have, in the name of the Calvinistic party, disclaimed the doctrine of infant damnation, and charged him and

* If any one will be at the trouble of comparing this passage with that of which it ought to be an exact transcript, he will have a specimen of Dr Beecher's ordinary accuracy in making quotations. It may be found on the 447th page of our fourth volume.

others, with bearing false witness against their neighbors ; not surely their neighbors under ground, but against living Calvinistic men.' pp. 44, 45.

Now if the reader will be at the trouble of comparing this with the note given above, he will see it to be untrue that the 'whole stress' of Dr Beecher's 'disclaimer respected not the dead, but the living.' He was equally explicit in respect to both. No one can read that note and imagine, that, in so far as his alleged thirty years' familiarity with Calvinistic authorities and his own character for veracity could produce belief, he did not mean to have it believed, not only that the doctrine in question is not held by the great body of Calvinists of the present day, but also that it has never been held by *any* Calvinists whatever, ancient or modern, living or dead. 'I have never seen or heard,' he says, 'of *any* book which contained such a sentiment.' 'I have never seen or *heard* of a man, minister, or layman, who believed or taught it.' This certainly was intended, if there be any meaning in the words, to apply as well to Calvin and Turretin, to Twiss, Edwards, and Bellamy, or to *any* of their party Dr Beecher may be supposed to have 'heard of,' as to Hopkins or Fuller, West, Strong, or the professors at Andover, to whom, as living and later Calvinists, it now seems we were bound to confine our attention. Yet 'when he proceeded to state his disclaimer, it had, as his complaint had, *exclusive* reference to the living!' Who, then, would suppose, that after this, one word was to be said with regard to the sentiments of such Calvinists as we have quoted, or that the whole point as to them was not conceded?

Again ;—'The *offence stated* is, that I have never seen a man, neither minister nor layman, who believed or taught the doctrine.' This, we allow, would be something to Dr Beecher's purpose, if it were only true. But the fact is that these words of his note are never quoted or referred to, except once, in the whole course of our review, and then, merely for the purpose of describing Dr Beecher. Instead of saying 'the eye or ear of Dr Beecher,' we said, 'the eye or ear of *him who has never seen or heard, &c.*' Such, we repeat it, is all the notice we have ever taken of his assertions respecting either the ministers or the laymen he has seen, and yet, from the statement we are considering, who would not infer, that the whole force of our argument had been made to bear upon the question of their truth or falsehood? a question which we left untouched and as we found it. The whole scope of the paragraph in which the

words occur,* related to the printed authorities we were about to cite, not at all to the 'men Dr Beecher had seen.'

Another point is, that one reason for our appearing in self-defence, was, that Dr Beecher 'disclaimed the doctrine of infant damnation in the name of the Calvinistic party.' Therefore, he says, the reviewer's object must have been to render the 'Orthodox around' him odious, by fixing upon living Calvinists the disgrace of believing a doctrine, which is one of those that Calvin, as we shall soon see, thought Servetus ought to be burnt for *not* believing. Now we are not logicians enough to see the necessity of any such conclusion. The charge against which we felt it our duty to defend ourselves, was what we regarded, and still regard, as an 'impudent' accusation of falsehood and slander, for asserting that infant damnation is a doctrine of Calvinism, and has been held to be such by Calvinistic writers. Now if Dr Beecher had made this charge exclusively in his own name, his high office and the confident tone in which it was uttered, would have been reasons enough for an attempt to repel it. But he pretended to speak as the organ of his party; and though we did not believe at the time, and have not had reason for believing since, that he was the 'accredited' organ he would fain be considered, yet the laying claim to that character, we were aware, would give some additional show of authority for his charge, at least till the claim was proved to be baseless—a work which Dr Beecher himself seems in a fair way to accomplish without our assistance. It is thus that his speaking in the name of the 'great body' of living Calvinists, became a reason for our appearing in self-defence, and not because we were anxious, or at all bound, to go from house to house, and catechise the 'Orthodox of Boston and its vicinity,' touching their soundness in the faith of their master.

But there is yet another of Dr Beecher's 'considerations' to show that our purpose was to 'slander' the living. Although we scrupulously confined the course of our remarks to 'those writers and their system,' still, he says, 'we did declare that the system which modern Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned.' Hence, to assert, as we do, that all our quotations were intended to show only a real and acknowledged connexion of the doctrine with essential principles of *Calvinism*, is mere 'finesse,'—the real object being to prove it upon the living professors of Andover, or at least upon the 'great body of living Calvinists' of the New England school,

* Examiner, Vol. IV. p. 438.

comprehending 'two thirds, if not three quarters of the evangelical divines in the United States,' who, according to Dr Beecher himself, believe quite another gospel! Is there such a thing, then, as rejecting the 'peculiar doctrines' of a system, and yet having a right to a name, to which a belief in that system is the only legitimate title? And is it Dr Beecher who says this? Are Unitarians Christians? Unitarians, who deny a total depravity, an infinite atonement, the trinity of the Godhead, and *all* 'the peculiar doctrines' of Christianity? If they acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of God, we, indeed, admit that they are; and that too, even should they reject doctrines which we might happen to think peculiar to his religion, provided they themselves cannot in conscience regard them as taught on his authority. And so with respect to those who at the present day claim to be called Calvinists, though they disavow a belief in the imputation of Adam's sin, the comparatively small number of the elect, and many other doctrines, which, to our apprehension, are so unquestionably taught by Calvinism. If they are honest in that disavowal, and still sincerely profess allegiance to Calvin as their master in the interpretation of Christianity, we are willing to call them Calvinists. But, in both instances, the right to the name essentially depends on the belief of those who assume it, that the doctrines they reject, are neither in the one case Christian doctrines, nor in the other, Calvinistic. But the Orthodox view this matter in a very different light. For, though they have not yet had the open hardihood to say that Unitarians knowingly deny the truth of Christian principles, they do, for rejecting what the Orthodox regard as such, refuse them the Christian name. How, then, Dr Beecher, an Orthodox man, can consistently call himself and his party, Calvinists, and yet acknowledge that he and they have so essentially modified the Calvinistic system, as to make what was once true of it, now to be false, and that too, in so vital a point as the imputation of Adam's sin and its kindred doctrines, we are utterly unable to explain, except upon the ground of his being, what in the beginning of these Letters he describes himself to be, a man who, 'in matters of importance, is not disposed to stand about trifles.' On his own principles, therefore, the principles on which he maintains that Unitarians are not Christians, how can he possibly say, that in declaring that the doctrine of infant damnation is contained in the Calvinistic system, we necessarily declare that the great body of those who now call themselves Calvinists, believe it? He might, with equal reason, urge a declaration that

Christianity contains the doctrine of transubstantiation, in proof that it is imputed to the great body of those who pretend a right to the Christian name. On his principles, the principles on which he and his party hold that Unitarians are not Christians, we should not hesitate to say, that they are not Calvinists, who do not believe that infants are damned. But upon our own principles, the only language we are authorised to hold, is, that such Calvinists are not consistent. And that is precisely the language we made use of in our review. For we have as yet nowhere said, that 'the system, which living Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned,' if by that system is meant, as Dr Beecher seems to admit, a very different system from the one avowed by Calvin and the Reformers, which, in our view, is the only true Calvinism. The words ascribed to us, are Dr Beecher's own, not ours. Even the words he refers to and misrepresents, were not ours; for we quoted them from a writer, who said, what since the change of '*views and language*' Dr Beecher speaks of, we may be pardoned for not thinking to be very wide of the truth; viz. that infant damnation is a doctrine 'which follows necessarily from the Calvinistic system, and which would now be insisted on by all real and consistent Calvinists, if they thought their people would bear it.'

Such and so successful is Dr Beecher's first attempt to evade the real question at issue between him and us. He has picked out here and there a casual remark or allusion of ours, which he has either perverted or misunderstood, and, by dint of these and a palpable misrepresentation of the extent of his 'disclaimer,' and of our statement of his offence, would persuade his readers that he is replying to our arguments in relation to a point, which, if they will examine our review, they will find we never touched. We say this, however, and have been at some pains to prove it, not because we would shrink from any responsibility we have ourselves assumed, or which may be justly, or at the call of circumstances, imposed upon us. But in the present controversy we have not yet undertaken, nor do we feel it to be our duty, to prove what we knew from the beginning it was impracticable to ascertain. With the opinions of the 'great body' of living Calvinists on the future state of infants, we have no means of becoming acquainted. Dr Beecher, indeed, tells us that they do not believe any of them will be damned. But he has shown himself so incompetent if he would, not to say so little disposed if he were able, to give a fair report of the sentiments of the dead, that with regard to the

living, we may be pardoned for hesitating to receive his testimony. Till his note and our examination of it were published, there has been no particular call for the expression of any opinion on the subject, and of Dr Beecher's voice we have not yet heard the echo.

Still, after all we have said in respect to the little concern the fact has with the true ground of this controversy, we do not doubt that there are living Calvinists who believe that infants are damned; and we are led to this conclusion by the very principles Dr Beecher himself has laid down. We may, or may not, be 'personally acquainted' with them; we may, or may not, 'ever have seen' them. Our acquaintance with living Calvinists, compared with Dr Beecher's, is very limited; nor does the little we have, as his for 'thirty years' seems to have done, extend, in all cases, to their private opinions on this subject. But, as just observed, we cannot doubt that many Calvinists are still to be found, though we shall not be at the trouble of seeking them, who believe that infants dying without actual transgression, are damned to all eternity for their share in Adam's sin; and in thinking so, we follow the very standard of proof which Dr Beecher himself has set up. For what does he say? Why, that that *part* of 'the stress of his disclaimer,' which, though the '*whole*' of it 'respects the living,' relates to the dead, 'was not primarily for the purpose of vindicating the dead from unjust aspersion, though this would have been a duty,'* but was urged 'in proof that [infant damnation] is not a sentiment adopted by Calvinists of the present day, upon the principle, that if the most approved writers do not teach it,' it is a reason for believing that 'the imputation must be a slander.' That is, in plain terms, if the doctrine that infants are damned is not taught by approved Calvinistic authorities, it is presumptive evidence that it is not held by Calvinists of the present day.

Now we not only admit the soundness of this reasoning, but contend that it ought to have great weight. For if Augustine 'neither believed nor taught' the doctrine, we lose some proof that Calvin did. If Calvin's 'strongest passages, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such doctrine,' we must obey the call of Dr Beecher, and, 'by all the sanctions of violated

* We can make neither English nor anything else of '*this would have been a duty*,' but must leave it with another of Dr Beecher's ingenious creations; viz. that '*traditionary fiction*,' which, 'for once, retained a verbal accuracy of statement not surpassed by written documents.' Perhaps the phrases are synonymous.

justice, retract the slander we have wantonly cast upon the memory of the holy dead.' Nay, more; we must put our mouths in the dust, and confess there is much less evidence than we thought, for charging it upon approved writers of his school. And if, 'in every age, the most authentic documents stamp falsehood upon the charge so long repeated,' then, not only must 'the memory of the illustrious dead have been blackened with calumny,' but the proof so thickens and threatens, that should we open our lying lips against the living, the gathering cloud would soon burst in torrents of burning shame, and quick coming confusion upon our heads. Not 'a living Calvinistic man' would give us shelter from the storm, and should we flee to the earth to cover us, the very bones of the slandered tenants of the grave would shake trembling into every limb, and their injured shades point meaning fingers to the depths below. If the reader will pardon this flight in imitation of our author's style—this humble attempt at the 'Ithuriel touch,'* he may discover our meaning to be, that Dr Beecher's argument is an argument of greater potency than he seems to be aware of. For, if all these premises can be established, not only will they make it probable, but, considering how closely in the schools one generation follows in the doctrinal track of another, they will make it morally certain, that infant damnation is not a doctrine held by the *great body* of living Calvinists. And especially, if the Calvinists of New England have, as Dr Beecher tells us, 'changed the mode of stating the doctrine of original sin adopted by the Reformers,—for views and language which utterly preclude even the appearance which the reviewer thinks he finds of ground for such an inference' as that approved Calvinistic writers have believed and taught the doctrine, why then, in respect to them, and all of their way of thinking, the charge must, most clearly, be a 'slander.' But it is an argument of 'great potency,' and, though we make no pretensions to the 'Ithuriel touch,' and have no 'dexterity' to boast of, it may in the end bring out most startling conclusions. For if the reverse of all these premises should prove to be facts, why then the conclusion must be reversed too. If Augustine, even in the very paragraph, a part of which Dr Beecher brings in proof to the contrary, *did* teach the damnation of infants, then we may suspect that Calvin followed him. If Calvin

* 'The reviewer, I am persuaded,' says Dr Beecher, p. 151, 'is not aware of the potency of his argument, or *with what dexterity*, as with *Ithuriel touch*, it may bring out all those doctrines, &c.—He will permit me, therefore, to edify him with a few specimens.'

taught it, and indignantly appealed to it as an incontestible proof of his doctrine of the decrees, we may expect to find it in writers who bow to his authority and believe his dogmas. And if 'in every age the most authentic documents,' so far 'from stamping falsehood upon the charge,' afford it as ample a support as from the nature of the case we could expect, or for the honor of human nature we could wish, why then, the 'unjust aspersion' from which Dr Beecher would 'vindicate the dead,' becomes an aspersion they deserve. And even in regard to the New-England divinity, which, we are told, numbers among its disciples, 'two thirds, if not three quarters of the evangelical divines in the United States,' the faith even of its 'most accredited organ as he would fain be considered,' may prove, in respect to the future state of infants, of something more than suspected soundness. Consistently with his own principles, therefore, if we can establish our position with regard to such Calvinistic writers as we have quoted, it seems impossible that even Dr Beecher should have the effrontery to repeat his vulgar charge of 'falsehood and slander,' whether it concern the dead or the living. For by his own showing, we shall then have more than reason enough for suspecting, that even among the Orthodox of the present day, there are Calvinists, and they are not a few, who believe, what he from whom they take their name unquestionably held to be true, that of that portion of mankind of whom Jesus declared, 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,' many, if not the greater number, will be found at the last to belong to the kingdom of hell. We ask again then, Has the 'monstrous doctrine that infants are damned,' been held by approved Calvinistic writers? Is it a part of the Calvinistic system? This, as we have already said, was the question we originally discussed, and it is the only question relating to this subject, to which it is practicable to give a satisfactory answer. It is a question, moreover, the determination of which, according to Dr Beecher's own modes of reasoning, must go far to settle all the rest, and which we shall now once more attempt to answer.

The essential, vital principles of Calvinism with which the doctrine of infant damnation is so intimately connected, we did not need Dr Beecher to tell us, can be no other than those of original sin, and the absolute decrees of election and reprobation, as the passages we adduced from various Calvinistic writers, all of them of the highest authority, abundantly showed.

Nor did we think it best to labor much, in our own persons, to point out that connexion, when the task had been so thoroughly done to our hands by Calvin and Turretin, the Westminster Assembly of Divines, Twiss, Boston, Gill, Edwards, and Belamy, all of whom we permitted to speak for themselves, and for us too. We shall still pursue the same course, confining ourselves principally to the question of fact respecting the sentiments of Calvinistic writers, because it is for them, not for Dr Beecher or ourselves, to decide in this controversy.

What we have already said, or cited from the authorities just named, we did think, and think still, was enough to set the point we meant to prove forever at rest. But Dr Beecher, who 'in matters of importance is not disposed to stand about trifles,' nay, who enlists in his defence even stale witticisms wrung from irreverent misapplications of what, if we mistake not, the multitude of Calvinists, and, for aught we know, he himself regards as the very words of God,*—this gentleman, who, in his earnestness to have us 'commit to memory the ninth commandment,' seems to have forgotten the third, tells us that we have totally failed to establish the point we set out to prove; that our quotations are nothing to our purpose; that we either cannot translate correctly, or have intentionally mistranslated, or garbled to suit our purposes, one of the very plainest of all Latin sentences; that in comparison with himself we know nothing of logic and but little of anything else; that we are weak, as well as ignorant, and that 'he does hope we shall go back to our hornbook, before we attempt to reason again for the edification of readers who are blessed with common sense.' Let us then go back, if not actually to 'our hornbook,' to the books we have quoted, and see if we have really made the gross mistakes imputed to us.

We shall begin, as we begun before, with Calvin himself, who, in a question respecting Calvinism, is the first, as he is unquestionably the most important witness to be examined. Dr Beecher contends that—

* In his attempt to show 'with what dexterity, as with Ithuriel touch,' our argument from Calvinistic writers may be turned against Unitarians, Dr Beecher quotes, and of course condemns, the following passage from Belsham, capitalizing what, we presume, he thinks most objectionable. 'The Scriptures,' says Belsham, 'contain a very faithful and credible account of the Christian doctrine, which is the true word of God; BUT THEY ARE NOT THEMSELVES THE WORD OF GOD.' If Dr Beecher thinks they are the word of God, in the sense in which Belsham thinks they are not, how can he reconcile his extreme levity, and even coarseness, in the use of them, with that deep reverence with which a thought so awful ought to inspire him that entertains it?

'a belief in the depravity of infants and their just exposure to punishment, is the only argument the reviewer has adduced, which goes to prove that Calvinists, as a body, ever did, or do now, believe in the damnation of infants.' p. 46.—'Calvin,' he says, 'as quoted by the reviewer, teaches only that infants are depraved, and under condemnation, which makes them *justly liable* to future punishment, but not that they are actually sent to hell.' p. 47.—'His [Calvin's] testimony, as quoted by the reviewer, concerning infants, is, that "they are born infected with the contagion of sin,"—"are, in the sight of God, polluted and defiled,"—"are all by nature children of wrath,"—that "*infants themselves* bring their damnation (condemnation)* with them from their mothers' womb,"—that "their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin, so that it cannot but and odious be abominable to God." ' pp. 82, 83.

Such, according to Dr Beecher's admission, was the doctrine of Calvin, and such, he says, has been the belief of all Calvinistic churches and writers in all ages, including those of the present day, with himself at their head, 'as he would fain be considered.' And in so far as it affects the character of the Deity, certainly the most important light in which the whole subject can be considered, this doctrine is quite as monstrous, blasphemous, and horrible, as that of actual infant damnation. Our reasons for so regarding it we shall not here stop to produce, however, it being sufficient for our present purpose to remark, that, with the unimportant exception mentioned in the note below, not one of the quotations of which Dr Beecher has here given the substance, was brought forward to prove more than he allows them to establish. In an attempt to show the connexion of infant damnation with essential, vital principles of Calvinism, it was a primary step to show, that, according to Calvin's account of human nature, infants, as soon as, nay, even before they are born, are really wicked, and odious and abominable to God, *deserving* to be punished to all eternity in hell. This is the connexion, and all the connexion of infant damnation with original sin, certainly a vital part of the Calvinistic scheme.

* The word which Dr Beecher here softens into 'condemnation,' is, in the original, *damnatio*, and Calvin, we are inclined to think, intended to say, that 'infants themselves bring their *damnation* with them from their mothers' womb,' meaning that they bring with them their punishment, their hell, their *damnation*, or, according to a common mode of speech, that which will actually prove their punishment and send them to hell. He has been so understood by the numerous writers who have quoted this passage in evidence that he believed infants would be damned, and was probably so understood by Thomas Norton, whose version of the Institutes has passed through many editions. The one before us is the sixth, and was published in 1634. He renders the word '*damnation*,' and in his index refers to the passage, in Lib. IV. c. xv. § 10, as showing that 'infants bring their *damnation* out of their mothers', &c. However, as we do not need the quotation for our purpose, we shall not urge this interpretation of it, but adopt that which Dr Beecher of course prefers, and which the words will, perhaps, bear.

It is the decree of reprobation, which, to the praise of Calvinistic justice, casts the little ones into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, their original sin proving only that they deserve their unutterable torments. The reviewer, therefore, 'did *not* need to be told, that, while all this is testimony absolute, that Calvin believed in the depravity of infants, and their just *exposure* to damnation,' it does not teach that they are *actually* damned.

So far, then, there is no dispute about Calvin's opinions, or those of his school. But, says Dr Beecher, this great Reformer, 'the holy dead,' went no further. He taught, as all Calvinists do now, that infants *deserve*, and are *justly exposed* to the torments of the damned, but has nowhere said that those torments will be inflicted, nowhere expressed his belief in actual infant damnation. Has the world, then, been for centuries so grossly deluded; and has it waited for the day of Dr Beecher to be set right upon a point, which any one of the millions who have died in error, if he could but read Latin as well as our author, might with ease have ascertained for himself? It is even so. A learned theologian of the nineteenth century, the very age of discoveries, and of inventions, too, has examined and cross-examined our witness, and can extract from him no intimation of a doctrine, for which, for three hundred years, he has been held responsible. We therefore do not wonder, that, with the indignation of offended virtue, he should 'call upon us, by all the sanctions of violated justice, to retract the *slander* we have so *wantonly* cast upon his memory.' For Calvin, we are told,

'believed in the salvation of all infants, dying in infancy, who are within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor. This is Calvin's belief in the damnation of infants.

'Calvin, it would seem, then, came nearer to teaching the actual salvation of all infants, than the damnation of any. For, sweep a compass round all infants who die within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, and how many will fall without the blessed circumference of mercy?

'Not a syllable, then, has been produced from Calvin, which proves that he taught that infants are damned. Hitherto, the reviewer has made the charge without evidence. And I now call upon him by all the sanctions of violated justice, to retract,' &c. pp. 86, 87.

But not only have we as yet produced no evidence of Calvin's belief in the doctrine we ascribe to him, but, upon the ground of his having particularly examined the whole subject and conscientiously reported the true result of his inquiries. Dr Beecher assures us that no such evidence can be produced, For—

'I have followed the reviewer through his windings, and mistranslations of Calvin,' he says, '*not because I could not wipe off by a shorter course, the aspersion cast on him*; but that the public may have an opportunity to decide what degree of credit is due to this anonymous Unitarian partizan writer; with what *limited knowledge* of his subject, and with what *unauthorised* confidence, he has spoken of the sentiments of Calvin concerning the future state of infants.' p. 86.

But what is his 'shorter course for wiping off the aspersion we have cast upon Calvin,' he does not anywhere tell us, unless it be in the paragraph in which he says—

'Now if we were in a court of justice, we should be permitted to cross-question these witnesses [Calvin and Augustine]. And, as a "deep stain" is likely to be fixed on our character, should we be convicted, I know not why legal evidence should not be demanded. I would take the liberty, therefore, to ask John Calvin a few questions.' p. 88.

Then follows the 'legal evidence,' and among the questions put to the witness is the following;—

Dr Beecher. 'Have you anywhere avowed your belief in the particular sentiment ascribed to Augustine—that infants are damned?'

John Calvin. 'NEVER. THE "STRONGEST PASSAGES" IN MY WRITINGS, HOWEVER TORTURED, CANNOT BE MADE TO TEACH ANY SUCH OPINION.' p. 88.

This, certainly, is speaking in plain terms, and it may very naturally be asked whether we shall presume to call in question declarations like these, made on the responsibility of a man of character, and a minister of our holy religion. Will you even attempt to disprove statements put forth with every assurance it is in the power of language to give you, that they were not made in ignorance or without examination? Can you think that a man, who has publicly, and with great apparent deliberation, accused you of 'falsehood and slander,' and is notwithstanding so tender of your everlasting welfare, as 'earnestly,' and even 'affectionately,' to recommend your committing to memory, without delay, the ninth commandment, as a protection against future temptations to violate the obligations of truth and justice—can you think that such a one would, in support of such a charge, make assertions respecting a matter of fact, which he did not *know* to be true? If declarations so positive, so full, so unequivocal, and a part of them, at least, intended to be so solemn, are not to be implicitly taken for everything that he who makes them would have them pass for, there is no safety in at all trusting to any the most common principles ordinarily relied upon in the every day intercourse of man with man. But, unfortunately, there is a boldness that is not the boldness of

knowledge, not to say, which is not the boldness of truth ; and that it is the former, not the latter, which is displayed in the paragraphs above, the reader, and Dr Beecher too, must allow, when we shall have laid before them a few passages from Calvin's writings, which we, indeed, do not think stronger than the one we have already quoted and shall hereafter notice, but which it is not impossible may appear in a very different light to this learned vindicator of 'the holy dead.' Of the many that might be quoted we shall content ourselves with three, which, 'however tortured,' can hardly be made to teach anything, if they do not teach the doctrine of infant damnation.

The first passage is taken from Calvin's famous reply to Sebastian Castalio, once his friend, but, at the time that reply was written, under his displeasure for heretical opinions. Castalio had said that 'all laws, human and divine, condemn a man *after* and because of transgression. But Calvin's God (*iste Calvini Deus*) condemned and reprobated the wicked before they existed, not to say before they were wicked or had sinned ; and because he damned them before they sinned, he compels them to sin, that he may seem to have damned them justly.' To this Calvin replies ;—

'As to what you object, that no one is justly damned, unless on account of transgression, and after transgression ; on the first point we have no dispute, since I everywhere teach that no one perishes except by the just judgment of God. Yet it cannot be dissembled that a hidden poison lurks in your words ; because, if the similitude you propose is admitted, God will be unjust in that he involves the whole race of Abraham in the guilt of original sin. You deny that it is just in God to damn any one, unless on account of transgression. Persons innumerable are taken out of life while yet infants. Put forth now your virulence against God, *who* PRECIPITATES INTO ETERNAL DEATH HARMLESS INFANTS (*innocuos fetus*) TORN FROM THEIR MOTHERS' BREASTS. He who will not detest this blasphemy [of yours] when it is openly exposed, may curse me at his will. For it cannot be demanded that I should be safe and free from the abuse of those who do not spare God.' *

Calvin, it seems, then, even thought it blasphemy to question the justice of that damnation of infants, which his generous vindicator thinks it a 'slander' to charge him with believing. What a satire upon 'the memory of the holy dead !' It is the severest of all the wounds of a friend, that which is inflicted by an indignant disavowal in our behalf, of what we have ourselves been imprudently prompt, if not proud to confess. That such is the character of Dr Beecher's zealous, but misjudged

* Tract. Theol.—Calumniæ Nebulonis cujusdam adv. Doctrin. Joan. Calvini de Occultâ Dei Provid. et ad eas ejusdem Calvini Responsio.—Art. xiv.

defence of his master, we have yet more evidence in reserve to show.

The next passage is taken from Calvin's account of the doctrine of Servetus respecting the corruption of the human race. It is the more important, because it stands in a work which was written as an apology for putting his victim to death, and is subscribed, not only by Calvin, but by the Ministers and Pastors of the Genevan Church, to the number of fourteen. If it has not, therefore, all the formality, it has all the authority of a confession of faith, with the additional weight derived from the solemnity of the occasion on which it was published. Among the errors of Servetus, then, Calvin and the Genevan Pastors, reckoned the following.

'In the mean time certain salvation is said [by Servetus] to await all at the final judgment, except those who have brought upon themselves the punishment of eternal death by their personal sins (*propriis sceleribus*). From which it is also inferred, that *all who are taken from life while INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN*, are exempt from ETERNAL DEATH, although they are elsewhere called accursed.' *

Such is one of the tenets for which the stern Genevan thought Servetus was justly condemned to the flames, and so important a point did he consider it and its 'kindred doctrines,' that had Dr Beecher lived in his time and preached as he does now, he would himself have been in danger of the stake.

The third and last passage to which we have referred, is contained in Calvin's work on the Eternal Predestination of God. One of the persons against whom this treatise was more particularly written, was Albertus Pighius, a Catholic writer, who, it seems, was opposed to the doctrine of unconditional election, and held such opinions upon the subject as were afterwards brought into greater notoriety by Arminius and the Remonstrants. Calvin represents Pighius as saying ;—

"To those who ask a reason why the wicked are damned, will not be returned the tyrannical answer, 'That they were separated from the elect by the eternal counsel of God, because it pleased God to devote them to destruction ;' as if it were said, *Sic volo, sic jubeo ; sit pro ratione voluntas* ; but they will hear from the lips of Christ, 'I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat, &c.'"

'Not very unlike this,' says Calvin, 'is what he [Pighius] says in another place.'

"Christ will not tell them they are damned because they were born of the infected race of Adam, because by his sin they contracted the desert

* Tractt. Theol.—Refut. Error. Mich. Serveti.

of eternal death, because they ought to perish for his transgression; but because they had not given meat to the hungry, and had not practised other acts of charity.”

To this, Calvin replies;—

‘If Pighius does not think original sin sufficient for the damnation of men, and will make no account of the secret judgment of God, what will he do with INFANT CHILDREN, who have been snatched out of this life before they were able, on account of their age, to give any such proof [of wickedness]? Since the same condition of birth and death was common to the little ones who died at Sodom and at Jerusalem, and there was no difference in their works—why WILL CHRIST, AT THE LAST DAY, SEPARATE SOME OF THEM TO HIS LEFT HAND, from others standing at his right? Who does not here adore the admirable judgment of God, in that it has been ordered that some should be born at Jerusalem, whence they presently pass to a better life, and that Sodom, the ENTRANCE OF HELL, should be the birthplace of others?’ *

Calvin, then, notwithstanding Dr Beecher’s word to the contrary, did believe in the actual damnation of infants, and it will throw horrible light upon the last quotation, if we call to mind the language of scripture to which he therein alludes. It is contained in the twentyfifth chapter of Matthew, and is as follows;—‘When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.’ On the left, according to Calvin, and thousands of his followers, will stand the little ones of Sodom and Gomorrah, for whose guilt in Adam, it seems that ‘fire from heaven’ was not sufficient retribution. For the King ‘shall say also unto THEM ON THE LEFT HAND, Depart from me, ye cursed, INTO EVERLASTING FIRE prepared for the devil and his angels.—*These* shall go away into EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT, but the righteous into life eternal.’—Such is Calvinism as taught by him from whom the system takes its name, but ‘of whose writings the strongest passages, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such opinion’ as that so expressly asserted in these quotations, and implied in a thousand others.

Still, Dr Beecher, who says he has been ‘*conversant* with the most approved Calvinistic writers for thirty years,’ and proves himself to be so intimately acquainted with the writings of Calvin, would persuade us that ‘Calvin came nearer to teaching the actual salvation of all infants than the damnation of any,’ because he ‘believed in the salvation of all infants, dying in infan-

* Tractt. Theol.—De Æter. Dei Prædest.

cy, who are within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor.' But where has Calvin said this? Dr Beecher has not pointed us to the passage, nor do we believe he can. The only citation he adds to those made by ourselves, is an extract from Calvin's answer to the inquiry of John Knox, whether the children, not of Roman Catholics, as Dr Beecher says, but of idolaters and excommunicated persons, may be baptized. But not one word about the *future state* of infants, whether those of believers or others, does either the extract or the whole letter contain. Calvin there says, indeed, as he had said in the quotations we made in our review, that '*the promise comprehends not only the offspring of each of the faithful in the first degree, but is extended to a thousand generations.*' But the point we disputed was, 'Whether this promise necessarily implies in the infants of those to whom it appertains, that sort of holiness which in itself affords any hope of their salvation.' The children of believers Calvin, it is true, considered 'holy,' that is, within the covenant, and therefore entitled to the sign of baptism. But, as we have elsewhere remarked, he distinguishes between the outward calling and election of a nation or body of men to certain privileges and distinctions, and that special election and effectual calling of individuals which is essential to future salvation. Now the promise to Abraham relating to the former and not necessarily to the latter, we contended that Calvin's language in regard to it, when properly explained, gives us no more assurance of the salvation of all the infants of believers, than it does of the whole race of Abraham, or of the whole christian race, many of whom he unquestionably thought would be eternally reprobated. Besides, we have proved that he certainly did consign some infants, with their parents, to the torments of hell. But if he believed, literally, that all infants, who die within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, are sure of salvation, 'the sweep' of his 'compass' would not have left these little ones to 'fall without the blessed circumference of mercy.' That is to say, believing in the damnation of some infants who have died in infancy, Calvin could not have believed in the salvation of all literally within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, because, even to this day, there have not been half that number of generations upon earth.

But Dr Beecher, in reply to a remark of ours, says—

'Grotius, it seems, had slandered Calvin, as Unitarians now do, representing it as his doctrine, "that, from the breast of the same Christian mother, one child was conveyed to heaven, and another to hell." And Rivet, as we now do, vindicated Calvin, maintaining that

"Calvin, and Calvinists in general, taught that the infants of believers, dying before they were capable of any moral act, were saved." And, really,' continues our author, 'we should have supposed Rivet's express testimony, and Calvin's express words, to be as good evidence as the reasoning of the reviewer to the contrary.' p. 85.

But Rivet's 'express testimony' amounts only to Rivet's reasoning, and why we should admit his arguments to the exclusion of our own, which we think to be better, we are at a loss to determine. As to Calvin's 'express words,' we can only remark, that, granting him to have used them, we still have, as we had before, a word to say upon the score of his consistency. We are acquainted with no expressions of Calvin's, relating to this subject, stronger than the following.

'If at this time any do sharply and with strong reasons defend Pædobaptism, I certainly am one of the number. Nor, as to the cause or end, is it disputed but that they are therefore baptized, that, being grafted upon the body of Christ, they may be freed from eternal destruction, obtain remission of the sin that is bred in them by nature, be clothed with gratuitous righteousness. * * * I do not grant that a child, who is taken off by sudden death before he could be offered for baptism, is therefore to be excluded from the kingdom of God. * * * For the children of believers were adopted by the Lord before they were born, when he said, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed." Nothing can be more certain than that the salvation (*salutem*) of infants is contained in this promise.' *

At first sight, 'express words' like these, do seem to assure us that all infants of believers are safe. But Calvin might, in consistency with his principles, hold the very same language of the adult, as well as infant heirs of the promise. It will apply as well to those infants who live and become men, as to those who die in infancy. The former, as well as the latter, are baptized *that they may escape* eternal death, obtain the remission of original sin, &c., and nothing can be more certain than that the salvation of such is contained in this promise. Still, many of them are not elected, but, according to Calvin, are eternally damned. Though by birth, or according to the flesh, they are entitled to the promise, in so far as it respects external privileges, they fail of becoming what he a little below calls the '*genuine* children of Abraham,' and are lost. If, then, Calvin's doctrine of predestination, as Dr Beecher grants, applies equally to infants and adults, why election and reprobation, which are but correlative parts of predestination, should not both apply to a particular class of infants, when there is no class of adults exempt from their application, we need Dr

* Tractt. Theol.—Append. Libel. de Verâ Eccles. Ref. Ratione.

Beecher's proficiency in logic to enable us to see. Till we make the discovery, however, we cannot condemn Grotius, whatever Rivet may have done, for charging upon Calvin's doctrine, the conveying from the breast of the same christian mother, one child to heaven, and another to hell.

As to Rivet, we not only 'seemed to admit,' but expressly admitted, that he 'held, with Calvinists in general, that the infants of believers are saved.' But such a statement of his doctrine as would make it teach 'an hereditary succession to the aristocracy of the saints, the continual transmission of the privilege of election by birthright, and the being born an heir of salvation in virtue of natural descent,' we did think too gross, and too inconsistent with obvious facts, to be assented to by any one. But not so Dr Beecher. For 'Rivet,' he says, 'believed it, although "it cannot be believed by any one." And why,' he asks, 'might not Calvin?' This, then, according to Dr Beecher, is the doctrine of Calvin and his disciples generally, 'when clearly and fully stated!' But Calvin's doctrine it certainly was not, because, as we remarked in our review, he has explained how it is, that, 'when the children of pious men are holy, still many of them are degenerate.' Respecting Rivet, we have only Dr Beecher's word in proof that he believed it, and if the 'great body of living Calvinists,' whose most accredited organ Dr Beecher would fain be considered, have authorised him to say that they assent to such a statement of the doctrine, there has indeed been 'a change of views and language' going on, of which we, certainly, have been totally ignorant, but which, instead of resulting in such an improvement in the mode of stating the principles of Calvinism as will divest them of their horrors and make them popular, will go far to render them ridiculous.

But it is of little importance to our present inquiry, what Calvin, or Rivet, or any one else, has said or thought respecting any particular class of infants. Calvin, as we have already shown, and Rivet, as we shall show hereafter, believed in actual infant damnation, which is all we are required to prove. But why, it may be asked, was not this proved, at least in respect to Calvin, in the original examination of Dr Beecher's note? His works were as accessible then as they are now, and contained the same evidences of his faith. To this we answer, that it *was* so proved. After citing passages to show he believed that infants, even before they are born, *deserve* damnation, we quoted another passage which proves, incontestibly, that he thought infants were damned. That passage, we repeat, was, in connexion with the others, full and incontestible

evidence that we had not misrepresented either Calvin or Calvinism on this point, and we therefore quoted no more. Dr Beecher himself admits it to be completely 'decisive,' provided it ought to be understood as we translated it. We shall therefore transcribe the original, the translation of Professor Norton, that of Allen, which is adopted by Dr Beecher, and our own translation, and demonstrate that Professor Norton's and our own are both correct, and Allen's indefensible.

In every edition of Calvin's Institutes, in which we have found the passage in question,* it stands, not as Dr Beecher has given it, but thus ;—

'Iterum quæro, Unde factum est ut tot gentes unà cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ absque remedio, nisi quia Deo ita visum est?'—'Decretum quidem horribile, fateor.' †

For reasons that will be obvious, and for others doubtless suggested by his intimate acquaintance with the language, Dr Beecher gives the sentence a new punctuation, with various readings, as follows ;—

'Iterum quæro, unde factum est ut tot gentes, una cum liberis eorum infantibus, æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ, absque remedio, nisi quia Deo visum est. Decretum quidem horribile, fateor.' p. 83.

Professor Norton renders the passage thus ;—

'I ask again ; how it has come to pass, that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, and this without remedy ; but because such was the will of God.' * * * *
'It is a dreadful decree I confess.' †

We next give Allen's translation.

'I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God.'—'It is an awful decree, I confess.'

Lastly, our own rendering is as follows ;—

'I ask again, How has it happened that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death without remedy, but because it so seemed good in the sight of God?'—'It is a dreadful decree, I confess.'

* We say 'in every edition in which we have found the passage,' because we have before us one, evidently of a very early date, but without a titlepage or imprint, in which it is not to be found ; or certainly not in the connexion in which it stands in later copies. The same is true of nearly the whole of the section in which it occurs.

† Inst. Lib. iii. c. xxiii. § 7.

‡ Views of Calvinism, Christ. Disciple, New Series, Vol. iv. p. 254.

Here, before defending our translation against objections, which, we are bold to say, no scholar would ever have dreamed of, there is demanded of us a word of explanation, if not of rebuke. In giving this citation from Calvin, through what Dr Beecher *must have believed* was either mere carelessness in correcting the press, or a willingness to abate something of the force of the passage as an evidence to our purpose, we omitted the words 'without remedy,' answering to *absque remedio* in the original.* We say *he must have believed this*; for he tells us that Professor Norton and the reviewer have both mistranslated Calvin. But in nothing, at all affecting the sense, do our respective versions differ from Allen's, which is admitted to be correct, except in the rendering, or omitting to render, *absque remedio*. Strike from Professor Norton's and Allen's, their renderings of those two words, and the three versions will all say precisely the same thing, and all three will be equally undeniable proofs of Calvin's belief in infant damnation. When, therefore, Dr Beecher said that Professor Norton and the reviewer had both mistranslated Calvin, there must have been a conviction in his mind that we both understood the passage in the same way. Indeed all his reasoning against the reviewer, is upon this supposition, and would be nugatory without it. If he thought upon the subject at all, *he must*, therefore, *have believed*, either that our omission of the two words was merely accidental, which is the truth, or, if intentional, a voluntary relinquishment on our part, of what would have made the quotation still more decisively to our purpose, if it had been retained. For, as the passage stood, Calvin says simply, that 'infants are involved in eternal death.' But had it included the omitted words, translated according to what Dr Beecher *evidently be-*

* We would here say that for this omission no one but the Editor is *in any way* answerable, did we not know that the gentleman, whom Dr Beecher has presumed in words, though we do not believe he has dared in thought, to accuse of a pitiful conspiracy in the case, might justly think himself degraded, should a word be uttered to defend him against a charge, which was so clearly made, not only merely to serve a turn, but with an evident consciousness of its hollowness. But be this as it may, the writer that accuses another of mistranslation or misquotation, doubtless will take all the precautions he knows how to employ, to be accurate himself. While it is therefore just to infer that Dr Beecher's 'filled with punishment,' for *pænā plectendos*, p. 88, his *involveret*, p. 83, and his *damnatione mitissime*, p. 88, are mere sins of ignorance, his giving an unauthorised pointing to the very passage he complains of us for not giving correctly, as it could not have been the result of accident, so does it justly expose him to the severest reprehension. Why, the omission of the word *ita* in the passage under consideration, innocent as it is, affords more reasonable ground for suspecting Dr Beecher of an evil intention, than there was for supposing that we thus omitted *absque remedio*, because his omission is only of no importance, while ours was clearly against our interest.

lieved was our understanding of them, it would have made Calvin say, that 'infants are involved in eternal death without remedy;' i. e. that they are not only damned, but remedilessly damned. If, then, the words were left out from any motive at all, it must have been from a motive which ought to have procured us, not Dr Beecher's abuse, but his thanks. Thus, we repeat it, *he must have believed* the matter really stood; yet, although such is the case, we shall not defile our pages by applying the proper epithets to his *pretending* to account for the omission by an insinuation, which to have made, in these circumstances, argues no small degree of the very unworthiness, which, *as he says*, seems to him to be implied in us. Publicly arraigned on a charge, which, if proved, he himself appears not unwilling to admit must seriously affect his character, he doubtless thought he should find it easier to defend himself against it, could he succeed in an attempt to cast suspicion upon the integrity of his accusers. But he should have remembered that a failure in that attempt, would render his task tenfold more difficult than it would have been if he had never made it, by proving him capable of the conduct with which he stands charged.

We are now prepared to examine Dr Beecher's learned effort to show, that we have made an unauthorised use of Calvin's words.

'The meaning of this passage,' he says, 'as a proof of infant damnation, depends on the collocation or omission of "*absque remedio*" (without remedy) in the translation. As Professor Norton has placed it, following strictly the collocation of the words in the original, the passage teaches that "many nations, with their infant children, are involved in eternal death, and that without remedy;"—and the reviewer, omitting "*absque remedio*" (without remedy,) though it belongs to the sentence, and controls its meaning so entirely, makes Calvin teach that "the fall of Adam has involved so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death;"—while Allen, by placing "*absque remedio*" (without remedy) in the translation before "*tot gentes*" (so many nations,) makes Calvin say, simply what himself and all the Reformers had said, viz. that, independent of any remedy, the fall involved all mankind in eternal death.' pp. 83, 84.

The first thing that strikes us on reading this truly original piece of criticism, is, that Dr Beecher evidently does not understand the difficulty he has himself started. For so far is the meaning of the passage, as a proof of infant damnation, from depending upon the 'collocation or omission of *absque remedio*, "without remedy,"' that it in fact depends upon neither. Erase the words altogether, and what remains, as we have already remarked, will be *sufficient* for our purpose, while, if retained, they may be placed in any part of the sentence, in which they

will not make nonsense, and yet the meaning of the whole will continue the same. So too with respect to Allen's rendering of the words; put it where you will, before *tot gentes*, 'so many nations,' or after *tot gentes*, if it makes any sense, that sense will not be in the slightest degree varied by any difference of position, as any one may satisfy himself, who will be at the pains of making the experiment. The 'collocation' of the words, then, has nothing to do with the objection to our interpretation of the passage which Dr Beecher meant to raise. The whole question, if he had understood it, would have been confined to two points; first, whether it is correct to translate *absque remedio*, by the words 'without remedy;' second, whether *tot gentes* means a part or the whole of mankind. Our learned author seems to think the first point a matter of indifference, provided he can be allowed to put the words in question before *tot gentes*, 'so many nations.' But surely the mere putting of them there, will not make them mean 'independent of any remedy,' if when put in another part of the passage they would mean 'without remedy.' Yet Dr Beecher seems to think so, else why, in every instance in which he gives us the Latin words, does he retain the rendering which we hold to be correct, and say that 'Allen, by placing the words "*absque remedio*," (*without remedy*) in the translation before "*tot gentes*," (so many nations,) makes Calvin say,—that, *independent of any remedy*, the fall involved, &c.?' The truth is, our learned author has taken, or, more probably, has had put into his hands, a weapon of which he plainly does not comprehend the use, and we hope the reader will pardon us, if, in obedience to Dr Beecher's recommendation, we for a moment 'go back to our hornbook,' and attempt to set him right.

So far as *absque remedio* is concerned, the whole dispute relates to the use of the preposition. Should it be rendered by the word 'without,' or by the words 'but for,'—'if it had not been for,'—or 'independent of'? In other words, did Calvin mean to say, that the fall of Adam actually involved many nations with their infant children in eternal death *without* remedy, or, that the fall of Adam would have involved them in eternal death, *but for* a remedy? A pitiful question this, most certainly, and if Dr Beecher had taken counsel of any schoolboy competent to the use of Ainsworth's Thesaurus and Adam's Latin Grammar, rather than of his reluctance to acknowledge an error in respect to the sentiments of Calvin, we should have been spared the humiliation of discussing it, and our readers the tediousness of such trifling. The lad would have turned to

his Grammar, and shown Dr Beecher, that although this preposition is sometimes used in the sense for which he contends, it is there said to be chiefly so used by comic writers, among whom we have not been in the habit of numbering John Calvin, and that in the example given it occurs in construction with a substantive verb. Next, in his Thesaurus, he would have found the correctness of his Grammar confirmed. Every example given by Ainsworth, is rendered as Dr Beecher would have it, it is true; but the examples are all taken from dramatic writers, and the word is in each instance used in connexion with the substantive verb, while Ainsworth adds, in a note, that the force of *absque* by itself is so uncertain, that he prohibits boys the use of it, *except in such constructions*, and thinks that the better classics never used the word at all. In this, however, he is certainly mistaken; for Facciolati gives instances of its use, in the sense of 'without,' by Cicero and others, at the same time adding his authority to that of the Thesaurus and the Grammar, for confining its use, in the sense of 'but for,' &c., to the comic writers, and by them always with the substantive verb.* Nor do we believe that even Dr Beecher's evident familiarity with Latin and Latin works, has helped him to a single instance in which it is employed, with that signification, in any other connexion. We certainly have never met with one, but the instances of its use in the sense of 'without' are innumerable. From Calvin alone we could produce hundreds. Should we proceed no further, then, we should not hesitate to pronounce Allen's translation of *absque remedio*, to be wholly indefensible, having been made with no authority from classical or other usage, but evidently with a design to soften down a rough and offensive part of the Calvinistic system.

But we have still other evidence in favor of our interpretation of the words. Our translation agrees with Professor Norton's, and, in so far as authority can settle the point, we want no better pledge of our correctness than this coincidence. But there is a version by another still, and he did not make it with a view to this controversy. We mean the old English translator, Thomas Norton, to whose work we have once before referred. But, although, according to Dr Beecher, there is 'but one light in the text to redeem it from perversion,' he too has had the hardihood to extinguish it, making the passage in his translation teach

* Thus;—'Absque hoc esset, *but for him*. Plut.—Absque foret te, *but for you*. Id.—Quàm fortunatus cæteris sum rebus, absque unâ hac foret! *except in this one*. Ter.—Nam absque me esset, et meo præsidio, hic faceret te, &c. *but for me and my protection, he would have made you, &c.* Plaut.'

the same doctrine that it does in ours ; for he, just as any one else competent to render it at all would do, translates it thus ;—

‘ Againe I aske : how came it to passe, that the fall of *Adam* did wrap up in eternall death so many nations with their children being infants *without remedie*, but because it so pleased God.’—‘ It is a terrible decree, I grant.’

Another translation is contained in Nichols’s Calvinism and Arminianism compared, part I. p. 19. It gives the sense in the same way, as indeed how would any one think of giving it otherwise ?

‘ What other than the *good pleasure of God* is the cause why the fall of Adam involved in eternal and remediless death whole nations, with their infant offspring ? I confess, that it is indeed a *horrible decree*.’

Nor is this all. We have before us a sixth version of this so difficult passage, and that, too, by one, whose ‘ integrity ’ may possibly escape Dr Beecher’s suspicion, while as a scholar he does not rank so very far below our learned author, that his version of ‘ an easy passage in John Calvin,’ must therefore be wrong, because it differs from the one Dr Beecher has adopted. We refer to Jeremy Taylor, and we shall quote more of his words than are necessary for our present purpose, to show in what estimation, as a Calvinistic authority, he held Dr Twiss, whom Dr Beecher will have to be no authority at all.

‘ If,’ says Jeremy Taylor, ‘ [we are guilty of Adam’s sin] by the decree of God, by his choice and constitution, that it should be so, as Mr Calvin and Dr Twiss (that I may name no more for that side) do expressly teach, it follows, that God is the author of our sin ; so that I may use Mr Calvin’s words ; ‘ How is it, that so many nations with their children should be involved in the fall *without remedy*, but because God would have it so ? ’ And if that be the matter, then to God, as to the cause, must that sin, and *that damnation*, be accounted.’*

Jeremy Taylor, then, as we do, regarded this passage as a proof of Calvin’s belief in actual infant damnation, and that without remedy. And since Calvin, after all, did believe in the salvation of a small portion of mankind, including a small portion of infants, Taylor must have thought, as we do, that *tot gentes*, ‘ so many nations,’ means, not, as Dr Beecher contends, all mankind, but those branches only of the human race which are cut off and reserved for the vengeance of eternal fire. But our author would fain show that this interpretation of the passage is completely set aside by Calvin’s course of reasoning in the context. We can hardly spare the room, but shall nevertheless transcribe

* Jeremy Taylor’s Works, Heber’s Edit. Vol. IX. p. 322.

the whole of Dr Beecher's argument on this point, that the public may see what kind of a controvertist we have to deal with. 'Allen,' he tells us, '——makes Calvin say, simply what himself and all the Reformers had said, viz. that, independent of any remedy, the fall involved all mankind in eternal death.' He then proceeds ;—

'That this is the true construction, the context does not permit us to doubt ; for the subject of discussion was, whether it is anywhere "declared in express terms, that Adam should perish by his defection." Not whether he should actually be damned, but whether he should, by that act, be condemned and exposed justly to eternal death. And, among other reasons to prove that the defection of Adam did expose him to eternal death, by a divine constitution or decree, he alleges the fact, that the loss of salvation by the *whole race*, in consequence of the fall, was by a divine constitution, and not by any natural connexion of cause and effect ; and demands, if the effect of Adam's fall upon his posterity was to subject them to eternal death, how can it be supposed that the effect upon himself, should not have been, at least, as fatal to him as to his offspring. "What prevents their acknowledging concerning one man, what they reluctantly grant concerning the whole species. The Scripture proclaims that all men were, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death." Then follows, after a few lines, the sentence in question, which is a pressing home of his conclusion, from the foregoing premises : "I ask again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death, but because such was the will of God."—Now, "so many nations," means, undoubtedly, not a few nations, a part of mankind, but is synonymous with what the same premises included above, as no one who examines the passage can fail to see. It is the "whole race," "the whole species," "all men, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death," of whom he speaks in the phrase, "so many nations." This being the fact, if you place "*absque remedio*" in the translation where Professor Norton places it, it represents Calvin as teaching the damnation of the "whole race," "the whole species," "all mankind, and this without remedy," as the consequence of Adam's sin. Will the Professor maintain that Calvin taught the doctrine of the universal actual damnation of all mankind ? And yet his collocation of "*absque remedio*" in the translation, compels him to do so, for the very introduction of the sentence, "*Iterum quæro*," shows that Calvin urges the same argument now which he had just urged above.' p. 84.

All this, we cannot deny, is fairly enough *reasoned* ; but the facts presumed in the case are not as Dr Beecher gives them. He has not only mistaken Calvin's meaning in the particular sentence in question, but he has also, in a manner to us utterly unaccountable, misreported the whole course of Calvin's reasoning in the section from which it is taken, and it is for him to reconcile it with that supreme regard for truth, which ought to be the governing principle in this, as in all other controversies. The very 'subject of discussion' Dr Beecher has misreported in

two respects. It was neither whether it is anywhere 'declared in express terms, that Adam should perish by his defection,' nor 'whether he should, by that act, be condemned and *exposed* justly to eternal death.' Calvin would have found no difficulty in settling these points by scripture quotations, had anybody called them in question. But the title of the chapter to which the disputed passage belongs, is—'A Refutation of those Calumnies with which *this Doctrine* has always been unjustly burdened;' and by 'this doctrine,' is meant the doctrine of absolute predestination by the mere will of God, the doctrine of irrelative decrees. The *general* subject of discussion in the chapter, therefore, was the objections to Calvin's doctrine of absolute predestination, and the *particular* subject discussed at the opening of the seventh section, in which our quotation occurs, is a particular objection to that doctrine. 'They deny,' says Calvin, 'that it is anywhere declared in express terms,' not, as Dr Beecher tells us, 'that Adam should perish by his defection,' or that 'he should, by that act, be condemned and exposed justly to eternal death,' but 'they deny,' to resume Calvin's words, 'that it is anywhere expressly declared, *that it was decreed by God* that Adam should perish by his defection;'—which involves a very different question indeed; namely, not whether Adam should, but *whether it was decreed by God* that he should, perish by his defection. Calvin, of course, concedes this point, or rather evades it by exclaiming, 'As if that same God, of whom the scripture declares, that he does whatsoever he pleases, created the noblest of his creatures with an indeterminate end!'

Having disposed of one objection, Calvin proceeds to another. 'They maintain,' he says, 'that he [Adam] had free will, that he might shape his fortune for himself; but that God *decreed* nothing, except to treat him according to his deserts.' To this second objection, totally distinct from the former one, the reply is, first, 'If so cold a conceit as this is admitted, what will become of God's omnipotence, by which he directs all things according to his secret counsel, which is dependent upon nothing but itself? But [secondly], predestination, whether they will or not, exhibits itself in the posterity [of Adam]. For it did not happen by natural consequence (*naturaliter*), that all men should lose salvation by the guilt of one parent. What, [then,] prevents their acknowledging of one man, that which they are compelled to grant of the whole human race? For why should they lose labor by evasions? The scripture proclaims that all men were, in the person of one, given over to eternal death.

As this cannot be a natural consequence, it evidently must have proceeded from the wonderful counsel of God. That these pious defenders of the justice of God should be perplexed and hesitate at trifles, and yet overcome great difficulties, is too absurd.' Here both the objection and the answer relate, not to what was to be the effect of Adam's fall upon himself, but to the question whether his fate was the result of an antecedent decree, a divine constitution, or the wonderful counsel of God, instead of being in the order of natural consequences. Calvin's opponents denied the existence of any such decree; 'but,' says he, 'whether they will or not, predestination shows itself in Adam's posterity, for surely it is not according to the natural connexion of cause and effect, that all men should lose salvation by the fault of one parent, and why should they hesitate to acknowledge of one parent, what they are compelled to admit of the whole race? why, after getting over the greater difficulty, should they stop at the less?' Such was the argument, and yet Dr Beecher tells us, that it relates to a totally different point, and that, too, a point which was not here disputed. For Calvin, he says, 'demands, if the effect of Adam's fall upon his posterity was to subject them to eternal death, how can it be supposed that the effect upon himself, should not have been, at least, as fatal to him as to his offspring!' But in fact Calvin demands no such thing. As we have shown, there is not the least agitation of any such a question. That point is all along taken for granted.

Having pressed the arguments we have stated, Calvin, in what next follows, brings still another consideration to set aside the last objection, and establish the doctrine for which he has all along been contending, viz. that the fate of Adam and of mankind is the result of an absolute *decree*, an eternal unconditional predestination according to the secret, inscrutable counsel of God. He had just put to them the question, 'What prevents their acknowledging of one man, what they reluctantly admit of the whole human race?' and he next puts to them, not the same question, as Dr Beecher would persuade us, but quite another; 'I ask again, How has it happened that the fate of Adam has involved so many nations *with their infant children* in eternal death without remedy, *but because it so seemed good* in the sight of God? *Here* their tongues, *on other points* so loquacious, must be struck dumb. It is a horrible decree, I confess.' This sentence, therefore, which is the sentence in question, is not what Dr Beecher calls it, 'a pressing home of Calvin's conclusion from [any] foregoing premises,' but a new set of premises, a new argument for establishing that con-

clusion. Nor does *Iterum quæro*, 'I ask again,'—'show that Calvin urges the same argument now which he had just urged above,' but just the contrary; as is evident by what he immediately subjoins—'*Here* their tongues, *on other points* so loquacious, (*tam dicaces alioqui linguas*) must be struck dumb'—as if he had said, 'Say what they will to all I have before advanced, *this* must be decisive.'

'So many nations,' therefore, does not necessarily mean, as Dr Becher says, the 'whole race,' 'the whole species,' 'all men, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death,' because the phrase is used in quite another connexion, and in an argument and with a reflection upon the fact stated in that argument, which, 'undoubtedly' and absolutely, require it to be taken in its obvious, natural sense, designating, not all nations, but only 'so many nations,' as any one who has ever examined the passage and the context, cannot fail to see. Three times in the few lines that precede this sentence in the section, had Calvin occasion to speak of all mankind, and in each case he uses the appropriate word or phrase. In the first instance it is *omnes*, 'all men,' in the second, *de toto humano genere*, 'of the whole human race,' in the third, *cunctos mortales*, 'all mortals;' and if he had intended again to speak of the whole race, he would unquestionably either have used a fourth synonymous phrase, or repeated one of these. But he had been speaking of *unnatural* things, things so unaccountable on common principles, that resort must be had, for explanation, to something extraordinary, secret, arbitrary, and inscrutable; and the more unaccountable, and the more repugnant to the feelings and judgments of the natural man, the stronger evidences would they be to his purpose. That the whole race should be *exposed* to eternal death by the sin of but one of their number, in itself sufficiently perplexing, was not the most revolting fact within his knowledge, though even this demands the supposition of an arbitrary decree, an 'admirable counsel' of the Almighty, to explain it. But there was another, fitted to fill with horror even him who could be the willing spectator of the last agonies of one whom he had procured to be murdered, and he brings it forth with an air of triumph at having found at last what must strike the gainsayer dumb. For a small portion of the mass of corruption, for a comparatively few of that fallen race which the guilt of its first parent has, by a divine decree, made odious and abominable to God, sovereign mercy has interposed and paid to sovereign justice the price of deliverance. But as to the rest of mankind, the great majority, including whole nations of unbelievers with their infant children, they are left in their lost estate by nature,

wrapped up in eternal death, *without remedy*, to be cast into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. It is a horrible decree, he is compelled to admit, which tears from the mother's breast and precipitates into hell the harmless infant; but then it is a *decree* nevertheless, and is all to the praise of that glorious Calvinistic justice, which might inflict upon the most *innocent* creature, the greatest possible tortures, and which is therefore not to be questioned for consigning these little guilty ones, these 'seeds of sin,' which were odious and abominable in the sight of God before they saw the light of life, to unspeakable torments throughout eternity, where they shall forever burn, yet never be utterly consumed. This is Calvin's doctrine; and to deny the truth of it, or call it cruel, is to blaspheme the God of heaven and of earth; and he who will not detest such blasphemy, says Calvin in another place, 'may curse me at his will. For I cannot expect to escape the abuse of those, who do not spare' the Almighty.

We have above given all which in the section precedes the passage in question, and it puts the meaning of that passage beyond dispute. But Dr Beecher has given for one continued argument on a subject which Calvin does not even touch, that which in fact is a series of arguments upon quite another question. Had he looked into the original, however, he might have secured himself against these egregious mistakes, if mistakes it is not too much charity to suppose them. But then the original would have compelled him to acknowledge the grossness of his error in respect to Calvin's sentiments on the whole subject, and that would not do. Be that as it may, in the margin of the Latin copies of the Institutes, and directly against the section we have been considering, he might have found the proper key to the true meaning of the whole; for there we have these words, intended to indicate the contents of the section,— 'The objection *that it was not decreed by God*, that Adam should perish by his defection, is [in this section] done away, *multiplici ratione*, by many reasons,' or, literally, 'by a multiplex argument, deduced from the end of the creation, from the omnipotence, wisdom, and incomprehensible justice of God.' This establishes the correctness of our interpretation of the context, and the indefensibleness of that adopted by Dr Beecher, in a way which it seems to us there is no possibility of evading.

But we are even prepared to give up all we have hitherto said, and yet, from still another source, redeem our promise to *demonstrate*, that our rendering of the passage in dispute is the only one that does justice to Calvin's meaning. All that has hitherto been advanced may go for nothing; for we have still in

our possession evidence that is irresistible without it, and which must of itself settle the point forever. We preferred the course we have taken, however, for the simple reason which we have already given; viz. 'that the public may see what kind of a controvertist we have to deal with.' He writes with an unblushing, uncompromising assurance and dogmatism, of which the force on the public mind has no doubt been well calculated, but the foundations of which, after all, rest upon air, and we should be wanting to the duties imposed upon us by our high vocation, did we suffer them to pass without an exposure of their emptiness. The moral influence upon the community of such unauthorised and overbearing boldness, unsupported, as it is, by the least shadow of right for its pretensions, cannot but be of the very worst character, and it is the duty of honest men to use all honorable means to exhibit it in its true character. It is therefore only that we have chosen to follow our author step by step, rather than to give a merely virtual reply to all he has said, by an independent argument on the main question at issue between him and us.—Let us then see what Dr Beecher tells us in another of his paragraphs, written in the same style of effrontery with all the rest. He is still upon the subject of the disputed passage, and, at the conclusion of his argument upon it, says;—

'It should not be forgotten, that the Institutes were published by Calvin both in Latin and in French, and that Allen had the benefit of both, and that the translation was made while a keen controversy about Calvinism was going on, when any prominent mistake would be sure to be detected. Far be it from me to insinuate a suspicion of the Professor's integrity. Much less of his ability to translate an easy passage in John Calvin. I have only to regret the fact, without being required to account for it, that there should be but one light in the text to redeem it from perversion, and that the Professor and the reviewer should both, though in a different manner, put it out; the one by a wrong collocation of the words in his translation, and the other by omitting them altogether.' p. 85.

And this is from Dr Beecher; and that, too, in relation to a sentence of Latin, which the merest *tyro* would blush to translate in any other way than that which Professor Norton and the reviewer too adopted. No, we have not forgotten that Calvin published his Institutes in French as well as Latin, nor that Allen, as he tells us in his preface, had the benefit of both. But we have yet to be convinced that Allen always made an honest use of his advantages. His translation, it is true, was made when a keen controversy about Calvinism was going on, and when any prominent mistakes would be sure to be detected. They *were* detected; and we do not hesitate to say, that, upon any offensive point of Calvinism, upon any point which Allen

might think 'too orthodox,' as Richard Baxter calls those Calvinists who believe in infant damnation, his language does not do justice to Calvin's as his rendering of the very passage before us, in one instance at least, shows. For his rendering of it is not according to Calvin's French translation, of which we too, to say nothing of Dr Beecher,* have had the 'benefit' as well as he. Calvin's own rendering demonstrates that Allen and Dr Beecher 'have both mistranslated Calvin,' and that the versions by Professor Norton, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Norton, Nichols, and ourselves, are all correct. We give Calvin's French, with the old orthography, in the following words ;—

'Je leur demande derechef, d'où il est aduenu que la cheute d' Adam ait enuelpé avec soy tant de peuples avec leurs enfans *sans aucun remède*, sinon qu' il a pleu ainsi a Dieu.'—'Je confesse que ce decret nous doit espouuanter.'†

Calvin, then, approves our 'collocation,' translation, and punctuation, and in so far as '*absque remedio*,' '*sans aucun remède*,' '*without remedy*,' is concerned, there is an end of the controversy. If a quibble be raised on the ground that Calvin omits in the French, the words answering to *æternæ morti*, 'eternal death,' in the Latin, the reply is, that after cutting off all *remedy* in the case, it was a matter of indifference whether he added the words 'eternal death,' or not, it being as impossible to doubt, what, according to Calvin, was to become of such infants as are *without remedy*, as it is to doubt to what place Dr Beecher would himself consign them, *but for a remedy*.

We intended to have finished this article in our present number ; but we have already exceeded our limits, and must defer what we have further to remark to a future opportunity. We shall then expose other mistakes of our author's equally glaring with those relating to Calvin's undoubted belief in infant damnation, produce other unquestionable authorities for charging that doctrine upon Calvinism and Calvinists, and take notice of Dr Beecher's remarkable admissions on the subject, which, to our minds, are as objectionable as the belief he disclaims.

*If, after publishing the Second of the Letters under review, in which he refers to Calvin's French as throwing a light upon the passage in dispute of which Allen 'had the benefit,' Dr Beecher was aware that Calvin had translated it as we do, would he have 'frankly acknowledged his mistake,' in his Third Letter, or at least in some subsequent number of the Spirit of the Pilgrims? That he has not made such an acknowledgment we know. Whether he would have done it in the circumstances above supposed, we dare not undertake for him to say.

† From the edition of 1562, which, of course, 'appeared at Geneva after Calvin's last revision and before his death.'

Notices of Recent Publications.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

29. Which Society shall you Join, Liberal or Orthodox? A Letter to a Friend. Boston. pp. 24.

THAT is to say, 'Shall you join Liberal society or Orthodox?' though this probably is not what the author meant to say. His spirit and his grammar are much of a piece. He pretends to invite his friend to a most impartial examination of the religious and moral tendencies of the Liberal and Orthodox systems, while he is in reality giving him a most partial and hypocritical account of the assumed superiority of his own side, which, as any one may tell, is the Orthodox. He no doubt thinks that he has baited a very cunning trap. But if anything is caught in it, it must be poor game and small. This Letter is a sort of second edition of the Letter from a Gentleman of Boston to a Clergyman of that City; a variation of the same tune. 'If you should read it,' the author asks, 'before the leading members of the Liberal society, and desire them to circulate it, would they encourage the investigation and the circulation, and be encouraged by it; or would they denounce the letter as a weapon of the Orthodox, which they were requested to wield to their own prostration?' *Weapon! wield! prostration!* Truly then the 'Liberal Society' would be very much to blame to give themselves any trouble in encouraging or discouraging it; and it must be a battle of frogs and mice indeed, in which such a bulrush 'weapon' as this could do any harm or good, by being '*wielded*' on one side or the other.

30. As you Sow, so must you Reap. A Sermon, preached at the Ordination of the Rev. Samuel Presbury, over the Second Congregational Society in Northfield, Mass. February 27, 1828. By John Pierpont. Second Edition. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

THIS sermon is an interesting exposition of the text, *He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully.* 2 Cor. ix. 6. The general principle which is thus figuratively expressed, is applied by the preacher to the refutation of the common notions concerning election, and the retributions of the

divine government both here and hereafter. A note is appended to what is said on the doctrine of election, p. 11, which is so pertinent to the present state of things among us, that we shall quote it entire.

'It may be said that we do injustice to our Orthodox brethren, when we either assert or insinuate that they hold the doctrine of absolute or irrelative election—the doctrine that, in electing "some to everlasting life," God had no regard to the works or moral character of the individual elected,—because, it may be said, *that view* of the doctrine of election is not often taken or exhibited by the Calvinistic clergy of the present day. To this I answer:—first, that which I have given is *Calvin's* view of the doctrine of election; and they who call themselves Calvinists, and would give the people to understand that they preach Calvinism, will do well seriously to consider whether, when they have renounced a doctrine of Calvin, they ought not also, so far forth, at least, to renounce his name, and the *credit* that his name gives them: and secondly, I answer, if that *is* said, and said truly, which in this note we suppose may be said, it only proves that, in regard to one of the "five points," if no more, the Orthodox of the present day have deserted the Calvinistic ranks, carrying their colors with them, and that now they stand on Socinian ground and fight the Unitarian battle.* Whether the clergy, when they know that, *in this respect*, they are Socinians, will let others know it, is a question which they will answer for themselves.'

As to the *credit* which is conferred by Calvin's name, we have long wondered what it is, but such as it is, the Orthodox are welcome to it all. He was certainly a man of high genius and deep erudition; and in his character there was much to admire and praise. He was fearless, persevering, zealous, and in a certain way pious; very much such a one as Paul was, before his conversion. His passions were fiery, impetuous, unappeasable. These angry passions invited him to the murder of Servetus—for we cannot and ought not to call it by a softer name; and it is miserable sophistry to try to palliate the crime by talking about the spirit of the age. All the murders and martyrdoms from Abel's downwards, might be excused on the same ground. We would as soon be called by the name of the Grand Inquisitor, as by that of Calvin; and rather too, for Calvin pretended to be a Protestant.

We are pleased that Mr Pierpont has given so much space in his sermon to an exhibition of what we will venture to

* 'Vide Calvini Institutio. Christ. Rel. Lib. III Capp. xxi. xxii. F. Socini Praelectiones Theologicas, Capp. xiii. xiv.'

say are, in the main, the only rational views with regard to the retributions of a future state. He insists with great force, that they will be awarded according to the principle of the text—the eternal principle of divine government in both worlds, which ordains that every man shall reap that which he has sown, and as much as he has sown, wheat or weeds, bountifully or sparingly. There is so much misrepresentation going about now, concerning the opinions of Unitarians on this subject, that we think Unitarians are loudly required to state distinctly what their opinions are, each man declaring his own without fearing to be called too Heterodox or too Orthodox, or anything else. That their opinions are very generally those contained in the sermon before us, we have little doubt; and we have as little, that the more they are preached the more they will commend themselves to the good sense of the community. The following passage from the sermon cannot be read too carefully.

‘It is said that Unitarians are Universalists; many of them professedly, and others secretly, who would be so openly if they dared to profess what they really believe.

‘I do not say that the doctrine is not true, that all shall finally be saved. I certainly should rejoice to know that they shall. But I do not find it revealed that they shall, for I find it not revealed that all shall finally obey God’s laws. I do not deny that there are Unitarians who are Universalists, any more than our Trinitarian brethren—who bring this charge against us, because they think there is something odious in the name, and something calculated to make the name of Unitarian unpopular,—dare deny that there are Trinitarians who are Universalists. But this may with safety be affirmed, that no man is a Universalist *because* he is a Unitarian. On the contrary, the Unitarian voluntarily retires from the broadest and best ground on which the doctrine of universal salvation can be defended, viz. the infinite satisfaction or atonement for sin, which the Trinitarian finds in the death of Jesus Christ. The argument of the Trinitarian is, that Christ, an infinite being, has, by his death, made an infinite satisfaction for sin:—that it was the very end and object of his death to make such a satisfaction; and, as it is unphilosophical to require a cause that is more than competent to the effect, there never has been, and never can be, a sin for which atonement has not already been made. The debt therefore, of every sinner being already paid, there can, in justice, be no further claim upon *any*; and all must be entitled to salvation, for that it has been purchased for all. And, granting the Trinitarian his premises, there is force in his reasoning. But the Unitarian, denying his premises, is not even led towards a conclusion so much at war with the analogies of the divine government in this life, with his own experience of the sufferings consequent upon sin here, and with what he believes to be the teachings of the christian scriptures, in regard to the sufferings that shall be consequent upon sin hereafter.’ pp. 17-18.

The answer to the charge that Unitarians make light of sin, is as forcible and just as we could wish it. The whole sermon deserves a wide circulation.

31. A Greek Lexicon, adapted to the New Testament, with English Definitions. By Samuel C. Loveland. Woodstock, Vermont, 1823. 32mo. pp. 376.

THIS is, on the whole, a very creditable little book. It is intended for a pocket companion to the Greek Testament, and is well adapted to such a use. Though not much above half the size of the smallest Elzevir, it is complete in all that it pretends to be. Indeed, it performs more than it promises. After the usual manner of American compilations, it loves to be somewhat multifarious, and to leave nothing untold that may seem related to the subject in hand. In a short Appendix, we are presented with the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, an account of the pronunciation of the Romain or modern Greek, a glance at the Masoretic points, together with a disquisition on the formation of the verbs and verbals in general of the Greek tongue.

The author has availed himself, among other helps, of Jones’s Greek and English Lexicon, which we think he is disposed to overvalue, and of Wahl’s Lexicon of the New Testament, as translated by Mr Robinson of Andover. He tells us in his preface, that he has ‘made it a uniform object to divest the work, as much as possible, of sectarianism.’ We believe it not only possible, but not very difficult, to do this entirely. A Lexicon, and particularly a miniature one like this, should not attempt to play the commentary; and we could therefore willingly have dispensed with the quotation from Dr Jones, under the word *ἵλασμος*. In general, however, he has avoided, as he ought, all controversial ground.

32. Observations on the Causes and Evils of War; its Unlawfulness; and the Means and Certainty of its Extinction: In a Series of Letters Addressed to a Friend. By Thomas Thrush, late Captain in the Royal Navy. Intended as an Apology for withdrawing himself from the Naval Service. Part III. York: Wilson & Sons. 1827. 8vo. pp. 64.

WE have already noticed the two first parts of Captain Thrush’s Observations on War. This third part consists of five letters—on the inaccordancy of the pro-

fession of arms with, 1. the principles of natural religion; 2. the decalogue, and the precepts contained in the law and the prophets; 3. the precepts taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles; the fourth and fifth letter being a continuation and conclusion of the subject, particularly in relation to defensive war.

In the first of these letters Captain Thrush considers the inaccordancy of the profession of arms, or rather of the practice of war, with the principles of natural religion. On this branch of his subject, which affords so admirable an opportunity of comparing the ferocity and more than brutal cruelty of war, even in its mildest form, with the benevolence which is exhibited in every work and every device of nature, the author contents himself with a beautiful quotation from Erasmus on the natural endowments of man, a fable from Dr Johnson's *Idler*, and a second from Dr Franklin. They are all exceedingly apposite, and the one from Johnson was new to us, as it was published only in the original papers of the *Idler*.

In the next letter, while it is admitted that there is no express prohibition of war in the Old Testament, it is contended that the situation of a soldier in service is almost necessarily inconsistent with his obedience to any one of the commandments of the decalogue, and with doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly before God, the summary of the religion of the Old Testament.

The third letter is devoted to showing that the practice of war is absolutely at variance with the peculiar spirit of the Christian religion, which teaches 'not only the forgiveness of enemies, but the love of them.' Another quotation from Erasmus places this inconsistency in a strong point of view. With what feeling can a christian soldier utter the Lord's prayer, to almost every petition of which war is adverse?

No one who has reflected on the nature of Christianity can doubt that if men could all be persuaded to act, individually and as parts of society, entirely in conformity with the requisitions of the gospel, a state of happiness and prosperity would prevail on earth with which the brightest pictures in history would bear no comparison. The doubt is with most persons, whether such an influence will ever be exercised by the divine spirit of Christianity over the selfish and ambitious principles of the human heart.

Speaking as philosophers only—taking our lesson from the page of history, and reflecting on the character of this religion as to its tendency to affect the conduct and motives of men, we may doubt, but with our doubt there is some reason for hope. But as Christians, believing in the divine origin of this religion and in its perfect adaptation to the wants and weakness of man, as believers in a Providence controlling all, and bringing praise even out of the wrath of man, our hope becomes confidence.

The argument of the next letter is directed particularly against defensive war. In this we cannot think that there is wisdom. All will be accomplished which the religion of Christ requires, if offensive wars are brought to an end. And, until a common tribunal of nations shall be established, to determine in all cases of national offence against the great common good, each individual nation must, as far as it can, vindicate its own rights, and national liberty and national existence be considered legitimate objects of defence; as, before the erection of civil tribunals, the life and freedom of individuals must have been of individual defence. We do not strengthen our cause by pushing it to extremes. Universal peace may prevail, and the right of defence be not affected. Perfectly wise policy and the divine philanthropy of the gospel, will be found to concur in forbidding offensive war, without requiring in national, any more than in private relations, that offenders against justice should go unpunished.

In the last letter the same doctrine of non-resistance is maintained and further extended; and though we cannot fully assent to it, without admitting a principle, which, literally acted upon, would go far to take away the sword and the balance of justice, we cannot but respect the candour and sincerity with which the argument is pursued.

33. *The School or Lessons in Morals.* Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. Boston. Cottons & Barnard. 1827-8. 18mo.

WE make no apology for so often noticing books written for children. When well executed, we do not know of any which, on many accounts, better deserve attention. The series before us is intended chiefly for children in the humbler walks of life, and is well adapted to their use. The manners, conversations,

and incidents, without having any taint of coarseness or vulgarity, seem faithful representations from humble life. The style is very easy and simple, and the stories are lively and well told. Every piece appears to be intended to produce a distinct moral impression. And though the virtue and religion which are taught, are pure and elevated, there is not, perhaps, a single instance of exaggerated sentiment, or of anything calculated to give the laboring classes false views of their situation in society. On the contrary, children are represented as performing their common duties without expecting or receiving extraordinary rewards.

34. A Sermon Preached before the Annual Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, in Boston, May 29, 1828. By Edward Griffin, D. D., President of Williams College. Boston. T. R. Marvin. 1828. 8vo. pp. 24.

WE have read this Sermon with unmingled admiration; admiration that a gentleman who puts D. D. at the end of his name, who is President of a College, and was once a Professor of Rhetoric, should have ventured to pronounce so remarkable a production before the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. In the annual discourse before the Convention, we do not usually look for 'fine speculations' or 'flights of eloquence,' but we do always expect good sense, good judgment, and good taste. We are obliged to say, that in the present instance we have sought for these qualities in vain. In their stead we have found grossness and inaccuracy of language, extravagance in thought, and downright contradiction in terms. We know that we use plain language; but when a per-

son sees fit to print a discourse abounding with defects and errors of the kind just mentioned, we hold it to be the province of a just and impartial criticism to let the world know of them. The charges that we have made we are prepared to substantiate by quoting page, line, and word. Let him that doubts the accuracy or fairness of our description, read the Sermon, and he will find that the terms applied to it are not too strong. As a specimen of the confusion of the Doctor's ideas, and his downright contradictions, we quote the following passages; '*ex pede Herculem.*'

'The Sanctifier of the world is absolutely promised to prayer;—But it is no ordinary prayer. It is the Holy Ghost himself praying in the heart of the Christian.' p. 10.

That is, according to the trinitarian scheme, God the Holy Ghost prays to God the Father to send God the Holy Ghost. The absurdity and nonsense of this statement, it should be remembered, attach not to us, but to the author.

We have room but for one more specimen.

'This world belongs to Christ. It was "created by him and for him;" and he has purchased it since and received it for the residence of his Church,—for the abode of men strung up to a high instrumentality in the service of his kingdom.' p. 18.

Thus the world, according to Dr Griffin, is the property of Christ by a double title, by creation and by purchase. For ourselves, we should hold that the mere fact of his having created the world entitled him to possession; and to talk of purchasing one's own property, is one of those mysteries in language and sense which we utterly despair of ever being able to fathom. And then the world is received, by its creator and purchaser, for the 'abode of men strung up!' We have done.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Mission at Calcutta.—'Agreeably to public announcement, a General Meeting of the Friends and Supporters of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta, was held at the Hurkaru Public Rooms, on Sunday evening, the 30th ultimo [Dec. 1827]. After an appropriate prayer by the Rev. W. Adam, Theodore Dickens, Esq. was called to the chair.

'The Chairman introduced the object of the meeting by briefly stating the circumstances under which the Calcutta Unitarian Committee was formed in 1821, the small number of individuals that originally composed it, the difficulties with which they had to contend, and the increasing interest which has begun to be felt in their labors both in India, in

England, and in America. He remarked that all who were present, in proportion as their minds were interested in the promotion of pure and rational religion, must feel that their nature was elevated and improved, and although he saw several around him better qualified than himself to preside at this meeting, yet he was grateful for the honor which was done him, and yielded to none in the great importance which he attached to the objects of the Committee and in his anxious desire to extend the blessings of Unitarian Christianity, to those who were prejudiced against its principles or ignorant of its truths. He then called upon Mr Adam, the Secretary, to read the Report; but as it was too long for perusal at one time, only extracts were read, the whole being intended for publication.

'The design of the Report was stated to be, to communicate information to Unitarian Christians in different parts of the world, respecting what has been done, what is doing, and what is proposed to be done, for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity in India. The first endeavour of the Committee after its institution, was to secure foreign cooperation; in which they have succeeded to a considerable extent, both American and English Unitarians having contributed liberally to aid them in their labors. The first object accomplished by their united means, has been the employment of a Unitarian Missionary, and another object for the attainment of which a public subscription has been opened, is the erection of a Chapel for English worship in Calcutta. The latter object was especially urged in the Report as essential to give full efficiency to the Mission. After detailing the proceedings and intentions of the Committee for the diffusion of religion and knowledge by means of Lectures to the Natives, Schools, Tracts, &c. a summary view was given of the state of the Funds which were classed under three separate heads, the Permanent Fund amounting to Sa. Rs. 25,000, the interest of which is applied to the support of a Missionary; the Chapel Fund, having a cash balance of about Sa. Rs. 9,000 in its favour, after the purchase of ground for 12,000 Rs., besides Calcutta subscriptions still remaining unpaid to the amount of 5 or 6000 Rs.; and the General Fund, or Fund for Contingent Expenses, which consists of annual, quarterly, and monthly subscriptions, and donations amount-

ing to 160 Rs. per month. Adverting to the defective organization of the Committee, occasioned by the peculiar circumstances in which it had taken its origin, the gentlemen composing it recommended a more complete organization under a new and more comprehensive name, that of the British Indian Unitarian Association, and with that view proposed a series of Resolutions for the consideration of the meeting.

'The first Resolution was moved by Baboo Durakanath Thakoor and seconded by Mr Smith;—That this meeting does hereby form itself into a Society which shall be called the British Indian Unitarian Association, having the same objects and principles as the Calcutta Unitarian Committee, assuming all the responsibilities of that Committee, and receiving their rights, titles, powers, and properties.

'The second Resolution was moved by Baboo Tarachund Chuckerburttee and seconded by Mr Sutherland;—That the members of the Calcutta Unitarian Committee be requested to act as the Committee of the British Indian Unitarian Association for the ensuing year, under the rules and regulations framed by the Calcutta Unitarian Committee for itself, with power to supply vacancies in their own number; and that the Committee be requested to frame and submit to the next Annual Meeting such further regulations as may appear necessary to give efficiency to the Association.

'Mr Sutherland seconded this Resolution. He observed that the talents and worth of the gentlemen nominated, and the esteem in which they were universally held in this Society, rendered it unnecessary for him to say anything in favour of such a nomination. He believed that when a Unitarian Chapel should be erected in Calcutta it would be numerously and respectably attended, and that the principles of Unitarian Christianity would be the only effectual means of dissipating that thick cloud of superstition which has so long hung over this land. He hoped he might observe without offence to any one present (alluding to the Native gentlemen) that in no country in the world, was the spread of rational religion an object of more interest to the philanthropist than in British India. Yet let it not be supposed that in India alone superstition exerted its debasing influence. Instances of it were of fre-

quent occurrence in countries esteemed infinitely more enlightened, and he hoped he might be excused for mentioning one example of it which had recently come to his knowledge. Because in his mortal agonies the late Mr Canning, whose loss Britain now deplores—the brightest star in the galaxy of talent that ever adorned the office of Premier, had no minister of religion in his chamber, it was alleged that he was an Atheist! A more revolting example of bigotry was never recorded.

‘Mr Sutherland concluded by expressing his opinion that within the past year, more especially, the numbers of those disposed to listen to the doctrines of Unitarianism had greatly increased, and his conviction that the labors of the Association would be attended with success.

‘The third Resolution was moved by Mr Adam and seconded by Mr Gordon; That this meeting views with deep interest the combined exertions of English and American Unitarians to establish a Mission in this country, pledges itself to zealous and persevering cooperation with them, confides in their continued sympathy and aid in the prosecution of the object, and earnestly solicits the assistance and countenance of such Unitarians both in Europe and America as have hitherto withheld their support.

‘Mr Adam in moving the Resolution pointed out the limited resources of the English and American Unitarians, the number and importance of their domestic institutions, and the proof of deep interest in a Foreign Mission which was furnished by the very liberal and disinterested pecuniary aid, which, under these circumstances, they had afforded to the Calcutta Unitarian Committee. To show the extent of the interest felt in this object, he enumerated the various places in England and Scotland from which subscriptions in aid of the Calcutta Mission had been derived. He also read a letter which he had just received from Baboo Prusunnu Comar Tagore, expressing that gentleman’s regret, that he was prevented by serious indisposition from being present, and stating that he was and should continue to be a warm friend to the cause of liberal religion.

‘The fourth Resolution was moved by Rammohun Roy and seconded by Mr Tate; That this meeting invites all Unitarians, whether Christian or Hindoo, in every part of India, to form themselves into Associations auxiliary to the British Indian Unitarian Association, and to

place themselves in communication with the Secretary of that Association.

‘We regretted to observe that Rammohun Roy was laboring under severe bodily indisposition at the time. We understand, that he has since, in some measure, recovered.—

‘At one of the intervals between the seconding of one Resolution and the moving of another, several questions were asked by a gentleman (Mr Douglas) respecting the rate of subscription, the constitution of the Committee, the disposal of the funds, &c., which were answered by the Chairman apparently to the perfect satisfaction of the meeting.

‘The Chairman again addressed the meeting, congratulating those who were present on the unanimity which had attended the proceedings of the evening, and on the encouragement which they afforded to the friends of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta to proceed, with firmness and zeal, in the prosecution of the high and important purposes for which they were united.

‘The meeting was then closed by a short extempore prayer by Mr Adam.

‘We observed that a distinguished foreign traveller, Count Vidua, was present, besides several other gentlemen of respectability. The auditors appeared to be much interested in the proceedings.’

Bengal Hurkaru and Chronicle.

American Unitarian Association.—

The third anniversary of this Association, was celebrated in Boston, on the twenty-seventh of May, 1828. The meeting for business was held in the Vestry, in Berry Street, at 6 o’clock, P. M. The proceedings at the last annual meeting were read, and a Report offered by the Executive Committee, from which it appeared, that circumstances had prevented the attendance of messengers from this Association, at the United States Christian Conference, held last Sept’r tho’ several gentlemen had been requested to perform this service. By the Treasurer’s Statement of Receipts and Expenditures, it appeared that the total amount of receipts the past year was \$4249.53, and the amount of expenditures for the same period, \$2911.90, leaving a balance on the 27th of May, 1828, of \$1537.63.

An amendment of the Constitution proposed by a vote of the last year, was then considered and accepted, the effect of which is, to add to the Execu-

tive Committee a Secretary for Foreign Correspondence.

The Officers of the last year were all unanimously reelected, and the Rev. John G. Palfrey, was unanimously chosen Foreign Secretary.

From the meeting for business the Association adjourned to the Federal Street Church. After prayers had been offered by the Rev. Dr Porter of Roxbury, the Executive Committee's Third Annual Report was read by their Secretary, the Rev. Mr Gannett, of Boston. The sum total of tracts issued during the past year has been 74,300. The number published since the commencement of the Society's operations has been about 143,000, none of which, with two exceptions, contain less than 12 pages, and most of which are much larger. A part of the society's funds have, at repeated solicitations, been appropriated to the support of missionary labors, with manifest advantage to their cause. Settled clergymen have been employed in this way, and always with injunctions to avoid whatever might disturb the peace of parishes or churches. Honorable mention was made of the services of the Minister at Large in Boston.

Notice was next taken of the encouragement the Committee had received, from their correspondence with various parts of the country, to believe that there is a general and a steady progress of christian light. At no time has a scriptural faith been more prevalent, more cordially embraced, more earnestly maintained, or more surely extending itself throughout the country than at the present. Especially is this true of the principles of religious liberty and christian equality, and the result of all is, that the Unitarian doctrines are diffusing themselves, and that attempts to enslave men to creeds, or deprive them of their rights as christian citizens, will meet with but partial, if any success. 'From the British and Foreign Unitarian Association,' said the Committee, 'we have received renewed expressions of sympathy; and we cannot but rejoice with them in the prospect of a partial removal of those civil disabilities, which have so long been employed to depress the English Dissenter below his due rank in society. We hail the first sound of the falling shackles, though they have been worn rather as a badge of distinction than an impediment to activity. It is grateful, as it signifies a change of public sentiment, and as it is a proof that injustice and error cannot always maintain their

power. We hope that we shall have yet more occasion to rejoice with our brethren, who dwell in the home of our ancestors, as they obtain a full restoration of their civil and religious rights.'

Among the auspicious circumstances at home the Report noticed the organization of the Young Men's Book and Pamphlet Society, and of the Boston Sunday School Society, and the commencement of the Unitarian Advocate, the Christian Teacher's Manual, the Liberal Preacher, and the Unitarian, and the publication of several works intended to illustrate the sacred scriptures, and to make the English reader better acquainted with their true character. Of the wants of the Unitarian community, none has been more evident or more sensibly felt than that of candidates for the ministry. 'The demand for preachers,' we are told, 'greatly exceeds the ability of the School in Cambridge, to which the Unitarian churches almost invariably look for a supply. It seems necessary, that the resources of this School should be enlarged, or that some other means should be adopted, to satisfy the continually growing necessities of the community.'

The state of Unitarian Societies at the South was next adverted to, and the Report closed with a respectful tribute to the memory of two distinguished members of our denomination, lately deceased, the Rev. Robert Little of Washington, and the Hon. Samuel Howe of Northampton.

The Hon. Judge Story of Salem then moved the acceptance of the Report, which was seconded by Joseph May, Esq. of Boston. The Rev. Mr Ware of Boston expressed a hope that the vote would not pass without a word of encouragement to the Committee of which he was a member. The Rev. Dr Channing then rose, and in an address of considerable length, enumerated the auspicious circumstances under which Unitarianism had taken its rise in this country, and endeavoured to impress upon its friends a conviction of the high responsibilities the possession of its truths imposed. Though the rapid progress of liberal opinions was itself encouraging, the circumstances under which that progress had been made were much more so. It is not the result of great efforts, nor of appeals to the passions or prejudices of men; but has been silently effected by sober and pacific arguments, addressed to the understandings of an enlightened people, by the diffusion of

general information, by improvements in education, and in general by that gradual enlargement of the common mind, which by embracing truth upon one subject is expanded for the reception of truth upon another. But not only are we encouraged by thinking of the manner how, but the place where this has been effected. It has taken place in the most enlightened and moral part of the nation, which has always been preeminently distinguished by its love of freedom, and is now justly claiming the high distinction of being the cradle of the religious, as well as of the civil liberties of the country. It took the lead in our political, and is now doing the same in our religious revolution. The blessings of the former have extended themselves to the humblest members of our community, and it was gratifying to see evidence that those of the latter are doing, and fitted to do, the same. The labors of the Unitarian Minister at Large have conclusively shown the adaptation of our religious views to the wants of the poor and ignorant, a circumstance of peculiar encouragement. There was encouragement too, in the very circumstances of this meeting. It was cheering to see how many were not ashamed to assemble on such an occasion, and for such purposes. The speaker then turned from what had been doing, to what still remained to be done. We have no monopoly of light, and it is our duty to impart it to others. The truths we hold are great truths, and the obligation is correspondingly imperative to extend them.

Judge Story then called the attention of the meeting to another and a most important subject, the discussion of which, he said, was loudly called for by the circumstances in which we of the present day stand. He referred to the attempts of late set on foot to establish in the state and nation an ecclesiastical power, from which, if successful, we shall have everything to fear. Gentlemen might say there is no danger, but on the other hand no liberty is long enjoyed which is not watched. Prevention is better than remedy. We live in critical times, and it might be asked whether we were safe even here, where religious liberty is secured to us by our Constitution and by the attachments of a long series of years to our free institutions. The various methods adopted to build up this ecclesiastical tyranny were enumerated. We are to have funds for the perpetual propagation of certain articles of faith. Human reason is vilified,

that the people may with less feeling of humiliation submit to the yoke in preparation. We are to have slavery of mind as well as of property. Property is to be tied to creeds and creeds to property. The history of these measures in other countries should put us on our guard against them in this. The authority of reason in matters of religion was ably vindicated, and a masterly argument was instituted against the 'trust deeds' lately invented, and an analysis given of that of Hanover Church in particular, showing that it was an instrument which was intended to enslave the minds and lock up the property of the people, in a manner which it was as unjustifiable in the one party to enforce, as degrading in the other to submit to. The various topics handled were treated with great power and with great effect, and we hope hereafter to do better justice to the whole address. After Judge Story's remarks, the question recurred on the acceptance of the Report—and it was passed in the affirmative.

The Rev. Dr Thayer, of Lancaster, next made some pertinent observations introductory to the following resolution; '*Resolved*, That the state of religious sentiment, and the progress of religious inquiry, are such as to afford encouragement to the friends of truth.' He was seconded by Mr F. A. Farley, of Boston, and the resolution was adopted.

The Rev. Mr May of Brooklyn, Conn. proposed a resolution in these words; '*Resolved*, That the American Unitarian Association highly disapprove the spirit of acrimony and misrepresentation, which is too often discovered in the religious publications of the day.' Mr May, in the course of his remarks, noticed the promising aspect of things in the State of Connecticut, which in many parts shows evident signs of an approaching emancipation from consociations and unscriptural creeds, which it is the duty of Unitarians to do everything to promote and nothing to retard. We regret, however, that he did not give some more particular notice of the facts upon which his resolution was grounded. He was ably seconded by the Rev. Mr Sullivan of Keene, N. H. who stated that the same things were true of his section of the country, and that the acrimony and misrepresentation complained of, were chargeable more upon the clergy than the people, among whom the spirit of inquiry was busily at work, and fast producing its salutary effects in purifying their faith from old corruptions and loos-

ening their minds from a blind submission to ecclesiastical dictators. The resolution was adopted.

S. Higginson, jr. Esq., of Cambridge, then presented the following resolution, which he supported by a statement of facts. '*Resolved*, That the increasing demand for Unitarian preachers, calls for an increase of the means by which this demand may be supplied.' The Rev. Mr Hall of Northampton, in an animated address, in which he spoke of the efforts required of Unitarians for the diffusion of their faith, seconded the resolution, and it was passed.

Judge Story moved, that the Report be printed, and circulated as a tract, which was voted. The Ascription, beginning, 'From all who dwell below the skies,' was then sung by the assembly standing, after which the meeting was adjourned *sine die*.

Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers.—The annual meeting of this Convention, was held in the Court House, in Boston, on Wednesday and Thursday, May 28th and 29th. No business of much importance was transacted, except that which regularly comes before the meeting, in relation to the charity for which the Convention was instituted. The committee to whom last year was referred the question of measures to be adopted respecting the dinner, which has usually been given to the ministers of the State by the societies of Boston, were not ready to report, in consequence of Professor Stuart's non-attendance. He had given his written views on the subject, however, but they were not communicated to the Convention. Some conversation ensued on a proposition for an indefinite postponement of the whole subject, in which the origin and history of the custom were detailed. The ground taken by the majority was, that it was indelicate to interfere in the premises. This was opposed, principally, by the Rev. Mr Wisner, an Orthodox minister of Boston, who was the most active debater on that side both last year and this. He could see no impoliteness in giving notice to his host that he begged he would not be at the expense of an entertainment in future, which has hitherto been very gratefully received and properly estimated, but which is now a piece of extravagance, and ought, for temperance and example's sake, to be discontinued. The Rev. Mr Hildreth, however, was of a different opinion, and thought the more proper course was to

leave it discretionary with the host to provide or not provide, and equally discretionary with the individual guests, to accept or not accept the proffered hospitality, asking no questions for conscience's sake. The latter view of the subject prevailed, as being more consistent with the rules of good breeding, and so the proposition for indefinite postponement was carried.

The choice of preacher was next made, and by long established rules it should have fallen upon a Unitarian. But the Orthodox seemed determined that the Liberal party shall not monopolize the credit of being the only reformers of abuses, and, leaving the reformation of the faith to them, took to themselves that of other matters, and chose the Rev. President Humphreys by a majority of thirtyfive votes. On Thursday, the Convention Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Dr Griffin. We have already spoken of the character of his performance in our Notices of Recent Publications.

Ordination at Baltimore.—On Wednesday, the 23d of April, the Rev. Geo. W. Burnap of the Theological School in Cambridge, was ordained as the pastor of the First Independent Church, in Baltimore, formerly under the charge of the Rev. Mr Sparks. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Furness, of Philadelphia; Reading of the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Briggs, of Lexington; Sermon, by the Rev. James Walker, of Charlestown; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Porter, of Roxbury; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Ripley, of Concord; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Stetson, of Medford; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Dr Bancroft, of Worcester; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Ware, of New York.

Installation in Boston.—On Wednesday, May 21st, the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte was installed as Pastor of the South Congregational Society in Boston. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Gannett; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Ripley; Sermon by the Rev. Dr Channing; Prayer of Installation, by the Rev. Dr Ware, Professor of Divinity in Harvard University; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Harris, of Dorchester; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. Mr Upham, of Salem; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Mr Greenwood; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. H. Ware, jr.

Ordination at Dennis.—The ordination of the Rev. Daniel Mansfield Stearns, as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in North Dennis, took place on Wednesday, May 14th. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Hersey, of East Barnstable; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr Lowell, of Boston; Consecrating Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Shaw, of Eastham; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Simpkins, of Brewster; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Stearns, of Stoughton; Address to the Church and Society, and Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Stone, of Provincetown.

Ordination at Brighton.—On Wednesday, June 4th, the Rev. Daniel Austin, from the Theological School in Cambridge, was ordained Pastor of the First Congregational Society in Brighton. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr White, of Littleton; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Francis, of Watertown; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Stetson,

of Medford; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Ware, of Harvard University; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Ripley, of Concord; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Burton, of East Cambridge; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Mr Field, of Weston; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Whitman, of Waltham.

Ordination at New York.—On Thursday, June 19th, the Rev. William Parsons Lunt, was ordained as Pastor of the Second Congregational Unitarian Society in the city of New York. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Colman, of Salem; Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Pierpont, of Boston; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Greenwood, of Boston; Prayer of Ordination, by the Rev. Dr Kendall, of Plymouth; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Frothingham, of Boston; Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the Society, by the Rev. William Ware, of New York; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Parkman, of Boston.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

RUSSIA.—On the 27th of April, the emperor of Russia made a formal declaration of war against the Ottoman Porte, and it is understood that about the same date the Russian army on the Pruth, passed that river, and entered the Turkish territories. No particular account of the operations of the army has yet reached us. The declaration enumerates various causes of complaint against Turkey for the last sixteen years, the principal of which are the violation of the convention of Akerman, and other treaties, the closing of the Bosphorus against the Russian trade on the Black Sea, the interference with the negotiations for peace between Russia and Persia, and the hostile declarations in the Turkish manifesto of the 12th of January. The emperor disavows any ambitious designs, and declares that countries and nations enough already obey the laws of Russia, and cares enough are united with the extent of her dominion; but that the war being brought on by Turkey, she must bear the burden of making good all the expenses caused by it, and the losses sustained by Russian

subjects. The objects of the war are to secure the observance of the treaties which the Porte considers as no longer existing, entire liberty, for the future, of commerce in the Black Sea, and of navigation of the Bosphorus. He declares that although he is at war with the Porte for reasons which are independent of the convention of July 6, 1827, with Great Britain and France, he will not depart from the stipulations of that convention. The duties which it imposed upon Russia he says will be strictly observed, and the Allies will find her always ready to act in concert with them, in the execution of that treaty, and always zealous to cooperate in a work which is recommended by religion, and all the feelings which do honor to humanity. The declaration concludes by saying that the emperor will not lay down his arms till he has obtained the results stated in the declaration; and that he expects them from the benedictions of Him, to whom justice, and a pure conscience have never yet appealed in vain.

It appears from various declarations from members of the British and French

governments, that an entire harmony subsists between Russia and the other Allied powers. The fleets of the three powers, which were disabled in the battle of Navarino, have been repaired, and are supposed to be employed in the waters of the Archipelago, for enforcing the convention of July 6. A body of French troops, prepared for foreign service, and a large naval armament with transports for the conveyance of troops, was lately assembled at Toulon and Marseilles, which was probably destined for the Morea. But it seems the Allied powers have resolved on a different course, and the armament has been dispersed, and the troops marched to their respective cantonments. The war between France and Algiers still continues.

GREECE.—Count Capo d'Istria has arrived in Greece, where he was received with enthusiasm by all parties. He has organized a provisional government, and has used great efforts to introduce order and efficiency into the different departments of the administration. In aid of the finances he has established a bank, and invited men of property in the country to invest their funds in it. He has endeavoured to introduce a system of organization into the army, and has taken decisive measures for the suppression of piracy. The attempt of the Greeks to obtain possession of the island of Scio proved unsuccessful. After having obtained the command of the whole island except the castle, and having held that fortress in a state of siege for several weeks, a large reinforcement of Turkish troops arrived from the Asiatic coast, under the protection of a fleet from the Dardanelles, in consequence of which they were obliged to retreat to the western part of the island, and were soon after taken off by Greek and French vessels.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The ministry of which the Duke of Wellington is the head, appears to be firmly established, notwithstanding the secession of some of its members, and they seem disposed to retain their power, by adopting a course of liberal policy, and by such reforms as are strongly called for by the public sentiment. A bill has passed both houses of parliament, by the support of the ministry, and has received the Royal assent, for the repeal of the corporation and test acts, and substituting for the

sacramental tests which were required to be taken as a qualification for office, merely a declaration that no privilege, power, or influence which may be derived from the office, shall be made use of to overthrow or disturb the present church establishment. A resolution, proposing a committee of inquiry into the Catholic claims, passed the house of commons, after a debate of three days, by a majority of six votes, in a very full house, viz. yeas, 272; nays, 266. After the adoption of this resolution, the house of lords were invited to a conference for the purpose of communicating the resolution, and asking their concurrence. The conference was agreed to, and five conferees were appointed on the part of each house to meet on a future day, named by the house of lords. This form of proceeding, though not without precedent, is quite unusual in the British parliament. At the conference, Sir Francis Burdett, on the part of the house of commons, submitted the following resolution, which was reported to the lords, and the 9th of June was appointed for taking it into consideration; viz.—That it is expedient to consider the laws affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such final and conciliatory adjustments as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the stability of the Protestant Establishment, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of his Majesty's subjects.

PORTUGAL.—Don Pedro, emperor of Brazil, on the 3d of March last, by a public decree completed his abdication of the crown of Portugal, in favor of his daughter, Donna Maria, who is recognised as queen of Portugal, by the constitutional charter, given to Portugal by Don Pedro, on the death of the late king. Don Miguel, the brother of the emperor of Brazil, and appointed by him regent of Portugal, during the minority of Donna Maria, has shown little disposition to regard the obligations of the constitution, but on the contrary seems inclined to assume an absolute authority, in his own right, as successor to his father. The friends of the constitution have been disgraced, the advocates of absolute authority promoted, and in many of the principal towns, except Lisbon and Oporto, Don Miguel has been openly proclaimed king,

without opposition. The British troops have been withdrawn from Portugal, and it is reported that all the foreign ambassadors, accredited at the court of the regent, have received orders from their governments to give notice of the termination of their functions, in case he should carry into effect the designs he is supposed to meditate, of having himself declared king, by a convocation of the three estates of the kingdom.

SOUTH AMERICA.—The information from the new States of the South, is not of a very agreeable character. Accounts have reached us from Brazil, that negotiations were in train, for a peace between that country and Buenos Ayres, on a basis which was likely to be successful, viz. the recognition of the independence of the country about which the two parties have been contending. In the mean time the finances of both the belligerent parties are in a poor state, particularly of the Buenos Ayreans, and what was worse for the latter country, their government is in a state of the greatest disorganization. The republic of Colombia is in hardly a better state. The government appears to be in a state of abeyance. The national convention, at the date of the last information from that country, was still in session, deliberating on the mode of remedying the evils of the times, and on amendments of the constitution, which should restore efficiency to the government. Bolivar was at Bogota, and had addressed a message to the convention, in which he resigned his office as president of the republic. He represents the government as entirely prostrated, and insubordination everywhere prevalent, and recommends a new distribution of power, in which there shall be a strong executive, and in which the legislative body shall have less control. If the reports which have reached us can be depended on, there can be little doubt that Bolivar will be constituted Dictator, and the forms of his administration will be regulated at his pleasure.

CENTRAL AMERICA.—The condition of this government is still worse than that of Colombia. Mr Rochester, appointed Charge d'Affaires of our own government, to reside at Guatemala, lately proceeded as far as Omoa, for the purpose of entering on the duties of his appointment, but he there received such information of the distracted state of the country, as induced him to return to the

United States. The late president of the union, Arce, had resigned. Two parties called the Guatemalians or Centralists, and the St Salvadorians or Liberalists, were at open war with each other. Honduras, and Porto Rico, were in a state of tranquillity. Mr Rochester left Omoa May 17th.

MEXICO.—The state of this country has undergone no improvement, but is rather growing worse. No effectual measures have been taken for sustaining the credit of the government in Europe, and the dividends on the large loans obtained in London remain unpaid. The Mexican stocks, as well as those of the other new American States, are consequently at a very low ebb in the European markets. Measures of still further severity against the Spaniards in Mexico, have been adopted, which have an unfavorable effect on the trade of the country.

UNITED STATES.—The Congress of the United States closed its annual session on the 26th of May. The measures of the greatest public interest adopted during the session, were, an act increasing the duties on certain articles of foreign manufacture, designed for the promotion of domestic manufactures; an act for the relief of the surviving officers and soldiers of the Revolution; an act appropriating a million of dollars in aid of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal; and an act making an appropriation for the construction of a break-water at the mouth of Delaware river. The first of these measures was contested with warmth in both houses of Congress, and the opinions of the public are much divided on the question of its justice and expediency. A large number of private bills were passed, by which the just claims of individuals, who had long sought redress in vain, have been acknowledged and liquidated.

A convention between this country and Great Britain, has been recently published, by which the form of proceeding is arranged, for preparing the question respecting the boundary line between Maine and New Brunswick, to be submitted to the arbitration of a third power. Mr Albert Gallatin of Pennsylvania, and Judge Preble of Maine, have been appointed commissioners on the part of our government, to prepare the statement of our claim, for this arbitration.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Groton, March 23d, 1828, Mrs Jane, wife of Rev. Charles Robinson, and only daughter of Stewart J. Park, Esq. aged 21.

The character of Mrs Robinson was one of uncommon amiableness. To strong good sense, and a sound, discriminating judgment, she united a high degree of mental cultivation and discipline. But it was the qualities of her heart, her kind and generous feelings, her meek and lovely temper, and the mildness and gentleness of her manners, that rendered her an object of peculiar interest and affection to all who knew her. Her character was a perfectly natural one. She had nothing about her that savoured of vanity or affectation. There was a simplicity and sincerity in her whole deportment, in all she said and did, that corresponded to, and evinced the purity and rectitude of her feelings. She was remarkably devoid of selfishness. She lived indeed for others; and it was her delight to witness, and as far as she was able, to promote the happiness of all within her influence. Benevolence was a prominent trait in her disposition, and it shone out in all her actions. She always paid a most delicate regard to the feelings of others; and she never allowed herself to make, nor, if she could avoid it, to *hear*, remarks to the disadvantage of others. The poor and destitute found in her a zealous friend and advocate; and so deeply were her feelings interested in their behalf, that she enjoined it upon her friends, as one of her dying requests, to be mindful of their claims, and to minister to their wants, especially in the rigorous season of the year. She was ever a counsellor of good and a prompter to duty, and in her early removal from a situation, in which she was fitted to be eminently useful, her friends feel that they mourn a loss which can never be repaired.

A mind like Mrs Robinson's was naturally predisposed to the reception of religious impressions. Piety, with her, was almost a native impulse, springing from the sublime and affecting relations, which she felt she sustained to the Father of Spirits. Her feelings towards her Maker were peculiarly filial. She delighted to think of him and speak of him as her Father; and her obedience and resignation seemed to spring immediately

from a principle of love. She was a Christian in the best sense of the word; and exemplified in her temper and life, those mild and amiable virtues which the gospel values most highly. It is upon this part of her character, her unaffected piety, her humble faith, and the singular purity and blamelessness of her life and conversation, that her friends will dwell with a soothing and delightful recollection. They will bless God that she was given to them; that they enjoyed her society so long, and that she has left behind her so bright and spotless an example.

The sickness, which terminated in her death, was long and accompanied with great bodily suffering. She had many distressed days and wearisome nights appointed unto her, but her patience and fortitude never forsook her. Her trust in God never faltered. 'My Maker,' she would sometimes say, under severe paroxysms of pain, 'my Maker has not forgotten me; he is still my Father, though his hand is stretched out over me in correction.' The more she suffered, indeed, the stronger her confidence in God appeared, and the more grateful she seemed for the supports and alleviations she was permitted to enjoy.

The closing scene of her life was affecting beyond description. She possessed her reason in perfect strength and distinctness to the very last moment. She took leave of her friends again and again with expressions of the most melting tenderness; and the only pang which death had power to inflict upon her, was connected with the thought that she should leave them sorrowing and desolate. For several hours she expected her change with the utmost calmness and composure. She spent most of the time in conversation with those about her, and gave them very solemn and appropriate advice. She expressed her strong belief that there will be a reunion of the virtuous in a future life. 'I shall see you again, I shall know you hereafter,' she said again and again to the friends who were weeping around her, and in this belief she fell asleep in Jesus; and those who suffer from this bereavement will find their only consolation in this belief, and in the remembrance of her virtues.

THE TOKEN FOR 1829.

S. G. GOODRICH will publish in October, the Token for 1829—edited by N. P. Willis. The work will contain 15 engravings by our first artists, and in all respects will be executed in the best style. The following extract will show the character of the work—

‘We have compared the work with the best English souvenirs, and in paper and print it is far superior to them. In the printing it is unrivalled. Of the literary department we cannot speak, as we have read none of the pieces. Among the contributors, however, we see the names of many of our first writers. Mr Willis is the editor of the work; and this is a sufficient pledge that it is well done in his department.

‘We feel authorised to say, that the Token for 1829 will be in the highest degree worthy of public patronage. It cannot, on the whole, be inferior to any, and it certainly must be superior to most works of this sort.’

Boston Courier.

RECOLLECTIONS OF JOTHAM ANDERSON.

For sale at the office of the Christian Register, 166 Washington Street, and by the booksellers generally, ‘THE RECOLLECTIONS OF JOTHAM ANDERSON, *Second Edition*, with other Pieces of a Similar Character.’

The following is the Author’s Advertisement to the Second Edition.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The *Recollections* were originally printed in the CHRISTIAN REGISTER, and were republished in a volume about four years ago. To the present edition have been added four chapters, which must be considered as closing the work, though they still leave it incomplete. The other articles were also first printed in the same paper, excepting one, which appeared in the CHRISTIAN VISITANT. The ‘Extracts from a Journal,’ represent strictly and literally what took place. Of the other pieces, some are founded in fact, and some are the offspring of imagination. But the object of all has been to do good, and it is hoped that they have not altogether failed in it.

May, 1828.

HENRY WARE, JR.

RAMMOHUN ROY’S WORKS.

Just published, also at the office of the Christian Register, and sold at the bookstores generally, the Theological Writings of RAMMOHUN ROY, the celebrated Hindoo Brahmin.

These works consist of ‘*The Precepts of Jesus, a Guide to Peace and Happiness*,’ and of the ‘*First, Second, and Final Appeals to the Christian Public*,’ in reply to the Observations of DR MARSHMAN of Serampore.

REMOVAL.

BOWLES & DEARBORN

RESPECTFULLY inform their customers and the public, that they have removed to the new stone building, No. 50 Washington Street, five doors north from State Street. By this removal they have obtained a much more commodious store than they formerly occupied, and have also a room in the second story, immediately connected with the store, which will be free of access to every one; particularly for clergymen and others who reside out of the city. All articles in their line will be sold wholesale or retail, on as favorable terms as can be had in the city. They hope, therefore, for a continuance of the patronage they have already received, and solicit the favors of all who may have occasion to purchase BOOKS, STATIONARY, FINE CUTLERY, &c. &c.

CLASSICAL, SCHOOL, THEOLOGICAL, and MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS, will be furnished to libraries and individuals at low prices.

B. & D. also publish a great variety of BOOKS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS.

Having paid particular attention to this branch of their business, they are enabled to offer a select and an approved list of Books for Juvenile Libraries, Sunday Schools, &c. upon reasonable terms. They still continue to publish their series of *Original Books for Children*, a number of which are now in Press.

LETTERS ON THE LOGOS.

Just published and for sale by Bowles & Dearborn, Boston, and J. R. Buffum, Salem, LETTERS ON THE LOGOS. By Charles W. Upham, Associate Minister of the First Church in Salem.

LIVES OF THE APOSTLES.

Just published and for sale by Hilliard, Gray, & Co. Boston, LIVES OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES; with Explanatory Notes. By F. W. P. Greenwood, Junior Minister of King's Chapel, Boston.

In Press, and will soon be Published, by Charles Whipple, of Newburyport,

A GAZETTEER OF MASSACHUSETTS:

Containing a General View of the State, with an Historical Sketch of the Principal Events from its Settlement to the Present Time, and Notices of the Several Towns, Alphabetically Arranged. By JEREMIAH SPOFFORD, Counsellor of the Massachusetts Medical Society. With a Map of the State.

FOR SALE

BY HILLIARD & BROWN,

BOOKSELLERS TO HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE,

The complete Library of the Rev. George Otis, late Rector of Christ's Church, Cambridge, consisting of upwards of 1000 volumes of well selected works in Theology and polite Literature—among which are—

Bishop Hall's Complete Works.	10 vols.	8vo.
Jortin's Life of Erasmus.	3 "	cf.
Hawe's Essays.	2 "	"
Massillon, Œuvres Completes de,	13 "	8vo.
Breitenger's Septuagint.	4 "	4to.
Bos's " "	1 "	"
Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica.	6 "	8vo. half cf.
Ainsworth's Dictionary.	2 "	4to.
Opere di Michiavelli.	3 "	" half cf.
Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy.	2 "	8vo.
Edgeworth Works.	Complete.	
Scott's do.	do.	
Schurihu's Lucan.	18mo.	

Justinian, Ed. Gothofroedi, a very elegant copy, cf. gilt and gilt edges. 4to.

The Historical Works of Hume, Robertson, Mitford, Gibbon, Russell, &c. &c.—in fine editions. Various Editions of the Latin and Italian Classics, &c.

The above books are selling off very low.

JUST PUBLISHED,

SCELTA DI PROSE ITALIANE, tratte das piú celebri Scrittori Antichi e Moderni, per uso degli studiosi di questa Lingua. DA PIETRO BACHI, Precettore nell' Università Harvardiana. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 472. Price \$1.75.

BISHOP WATSON'S APOLOGY for the Bible, being an Answer to Paine's Age of Reason.

The zeal with which the disciples of Paine are publicly distributing the Age of Reason, and other infidel publications, has suggested to the publishers the necessity of a new and cheap edition of the very valuable answer of Bishop Watson. They have therefore published a neat edition in 18mo. containing 173 pages, which may be had at any of the Bookstores in Boston, and generally through the country at the low price of \$18 per hundred, \$2.20 per dozen, and 25 cts. for a single copy.

LESSONS FOR ADULTS. 2d Edition. 12mo.

SCRIPTURE LESSONS selected from the Old and New Testament ; for the use of Sunday and other Schools. 12mo.

WORKS FOR SALE BY HILLIARD & BROWN.

- South's Sermons. 1 vol. 8vo.
 Paley's do. do. 8vo. London.
 Paley's do. an Additional Volume lately published.
 Butler's do.
 Robert Robinson's Sermons.
 Walker's Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. London.
 Massillon's do. 8vo. London.
 Buckminster's Sermons. 8vo.
 Thatcher's do. 8vo.
 Butler's Horæ Biblicæ. 2 vols. 8vo. London.
 Hartley on Man. 2 vols. 8vo. London.
 Taylor's Holy Living and Dying. 8vo. and 12mo. London.
 Crabbe's Historical and Technological Dictionary. 4to. London.
 Ainsworth's Dictionary. 4to. Calf. London.
 Hederici Lexicon.
 Complete Sets of the Christian Disciple.
 do. do. Christian Examiner.
 do. do. North American Review.
 do. do. Edinburgh Review.
 do. do. Quarterly do.
 do. do. New Monthly Magazine.
 do. do. Westminster Review.
 do. do. Retrospective do.
 do. do. General Repository. }
 ☞ Very scarce. }
 do. do. Unitarian Miscellany.
 Edgeworth's Works Complete. 13 vols. 8vo.
 Burke's do. do. 7 vols. 8vo.
 Scott's Poetical Works.
 do. Novels and Romances.
 Byron's Works.
 Anderson's History of Commerce. 6 vols. 8vo.
 The Dramatic Works of Ben Johnson. 4to.
 Joanna Baillie's Plays. 3 vols. 8vo.
 Gray's Edition, of Butler's Hudibras. 3 vols. 8vo.
 Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by Prof. Turner. 8vo.
 Le Clerc's History of Russia. 6 vols. 4to.

H. & B. have JUST RECEIVED from LONDON and PARIS upwards of 4000 volumes of Books in various departments of Literature, among which are some of the most beautiful Editions of English, French, Spanish, and Italian authors; and also, Grammars, and cheap copies of standard works, in French, Spanish, and Italian. They are confident that their collection of Books in these Languages is as complete as that of any foreign bookseller in New England, and their prices shall be as low as those of any Importers in the Country.

ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS.

EDWARD WILLMER, Liverpool, sends out by every packet ship the following London Daily Newspapers, at HALF the COUNTRY price :

The SUN. (*This paper, by a constant persevering attention to furnish, at a great expense, the very latest intelligence, has become the first English Newspaper ; and its constantly increasing sale authorises E. W. to recommend it in preference to any other Evening Paper.*)—The Morning Herald.—New Times.—The Courier.—The Times.—The Globe.—The British Traveller and Morning Chronicle.

And the following London Weekly Papers at the Country price :

The Trades' Free Press.—Bell's Life in London.—Sunday Times.—Weekly Times.—Bell's Despatch.—The Atlas.—The News.—The Examiner.—The Observer.—Bell's Messenger.—The John Bull.—The Watchman.—The Age.—The Sunday Monitor.—The Sunday Advertiser.—The Englishman.—The World.—Literary Gazette.—Literary Chronicle.—The London Review.—The Sphynx.—The Athenæum.—London Mercury.—The Record.

The very latest London and Liverpool Papers are shipped on the day the Packet sails, at the full Country price.

LONDON MAGAZINES.

All the London Magazines despatched by the Packet Ship which leaves on the FIRST of every month.

NEW BOOKS.

All the new English Works are forwarded by the very first vessel which sails after they are published.

* * All orders must be accompanied by an order upon a Liverpool or London House for payment, which is collected quarterly.

THE LIBERAL PREACHER.

XI. '*On the Balance of Character,*' by Rev. James Walker, Charlestown, Mass.

XII. '*On the Doctrines of Grace,*' by Rev. Winthrop Bailey, Greenfield, Mass.

TERMS.

1. A number is published the first week of every month, and will contain one long, or two shorter sermons.—2. Price One Dollar a year—(exclusive of postage) to be paid in advance.—3. Five or more persons uniting, and forwarding their subscriptions, may receive the work for the year at eighty cents.—4. Applications to be addressed (post paid) to either of the Publishers, JOHN PRENTISS, *Keene, N. H.* or BOWLES & DEARBORN, *Boston.*

JUST PUBLISHED BY S. G. GOODRICH
THE AMERICAN COMMON-PLACE BOOK OF PROSE,
consisting of Selections of Beautiful Passages, from American Writers.

AGENTS

FOR THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

BOWLES & DEARBORN,
NO. 50, WASHINGTON STREET,—BOSTON.

MAINE.

PORTLAND,	James Adams, Jr.
SACO,	Putnam & Blake.
HALLOWELL,	C. Spaulding.
BELFAST,	E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA,	H. Spaulding.
BANGOR,	B. F. Nourse.
EASTPORT,	B. Folsom.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH,	J. W. Foster.
EXETER,	F. Grant.
DOVER,	S. C. Stevens.
KEENE,	John Prentiss.
CONCORD,	J. B. Moore.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON,	C. Goodrich.
-------------	--------------

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE,	Hilliard & Brown.
CONCORD,	J. Stacy.
SALEM,	{ J. R. Buffum.
	{ Whipple & Lawrence.
NEWBURYPORT,	Charles Whipple.
NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.
NANTUCKET,	John Thornton.
LANCASTER,	H. & G. Carter.
GROTON,	A. Richardson.
WORCESTER,	C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD,	Elisha Edwards.
NORTHAMPTON,	Simeon Butler.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE,	G. Dana.
-------------	----------

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN,	H. Howe.
HARTFORD,	H. & F. J. Huntington

NEW YORK.

ALBANY,	C. Steele & Son.
NEW YORK,	C. S. Francis.
TRENTON,	Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA,	J. D. Bemis, & Co.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA,	R. H. Small.
PITTSBURG,	Johnson & Stockton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE,	E. J. Cole.
------------	-------------

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON,	P. Thompson.
-------------	--------------

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND,	J. H. & T. Nash
-----------	-----------------

OHIO.

CINCINNATI,	E. H. Flint.
-------------	--------------

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH,	J. Gales & Son.
----------	-----------------

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON,	Thomas Cousins.
COLUMBIA,	J. W. Arthur.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA,	Thos. S. Metcalf.
SAVANNAH,	H. Ely.

All Communications whatever, relating to this work, *excepting such as pertain to the payment of subscriptions and the settling of accounts*, are to be directed to THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, BOSTON.

All *payments* are to be made to, and all *accounts* settled with BOWLES & DEARBORN, 50 Washington Street, Boston.

☞ The work will be sent *by mail*, to any part of the United States, on the remittance of one year's subscription (three dollars) to Bowles & Dearborn, Boston, or to any other agent,—subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number, that is, on the 20th of April. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscription as soon as they receive the second number of each year.